

9  
**Pulpit-Popery,**

TRUE POPERY:

BEING AN

**ANSWER**

[by G. G. G.]

To a BOOK Intituled,

**PULPIT-SAYINGS:**

AND IN

**VINDICATION**

OF THE

**APOLOGY for the PULPITS,**

AND THE

**STATE of the CONTROVERSIE**

against the REPRESENTER. [J. Lovell?]

[W. Claggett]

John Williams

*J. Williams H. M.*

L O N D O N,

Printed, and are to be Sold by *Randall Taylor*, near  
*Stationers-Hall*, M D C L X X X V I I I.

8



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



---

# THE CONTENTS.

**T**HE whole Controversy is resolv'd into the Author  
himself. Page 1.

The Unreasonableness of charging Misrepresentation on the  
Pulpits. p. 2.

None more guilty of Misrepresentation than those of the  
Church of Rome, and our Author in particular. P. 3, 4.

Our Author's mistake in framing Characters. p. 6.

## Character I.

About the Popish-Plot. p. 7.

## Character II.

About the Murder of K. Charles the 1st, with an Answer  
to the Challenge. p. 8.

## Character III.

About the Fire of London. *ibid.*

## Character IV.

Of Popish Emissaries. p. 9.

## Character V.

Of the Divisions and Fanaticism in the Church of Rome.  
p. 12, 15.

## Character VI.

Of a proper Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Sacrament. p. 17.

Mr. Thorndike Vindicated. p. 18.

Of a Sacramental Presence, and breaking of a true Body.  
p. 20.

Character

## The Contents.

### Character VII.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>Popery puts out the understanding of those of her Communion.</i>           | p. 21. |
| <i>The Difference betwixt the Severity of the Church of England and Rome.</i> | p. 23. |
| <i>The Absurdity of Auricular Confession.</i>                                 | p. 24. |
| <i>In Transubstantiation they renounce their Senses.</i>                      | p. 25. |
| <i>The Popish-Plea, That Hearing is for Transubstantiation.</i>               | ibid.  |
| <i>The Pope alone cannot Err, and all others cannot but Err.</i>              | p. 26. |

### Character VII.

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <i>Of Praying and Propheying in an Unknown Tongue.</i> | p. 27. |
| <i>Of the Sense of Propheying.</i>                     | p. 29. |
| <i>Of the ill Use made of Auricular Confession.</i>    | p. 30. |

### Character IX.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>Of Saints Canonized for Money and Treason.</i>   | ibid.  |
| <i>Of Praying to a Crucifix.</i>  | p. 31. |
| <i>Auricular Confession tends to the debauching Laity and Clergy. And of Confession in the Church of England.</i> | p. 32. |

### Character X.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>The Churches Interest, the Centre of their Religion.</i> | p. 33. |
|---|--------|

### Character XI.

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <i>Of the Legends in the Church of Rome.</i>         | p. 34. |
| <i>Of the turning Sacraments into Shews.</i>         | p. 37. |
| <i>Of Preaching Purgatory instead of Repentance.</i> | p. 38. |
| <i>And Faction instead of Faith.</i>                 | p. 39. |
| <i>Of the Preachers in the Holy League.</i>          | p. 40. |

### Character XII.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>Of Alms in the Church of Rome.</i>                                   | p. 40. |
| <i>Of Exorcisms.</i>  | p. 41. |
| <i>Of the Difficulty of knowing the Doctrine of the Church of Rome.</i> | p. 42. |

Of

## The Contents.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Of compounding for unforſaken ſins,</i>                 | P. 43, 45. |
| <i>Dr. T. Translation of Pœnitentia Vindicated,</i>        | P. 44.     |
| <i>Indulgences for Thouſands of years to come,</i>         | P. 46.     |
| <i>Indulgences not a Relaxation of Canonical penances,</i> | p. 48.     |

### Character XIII.

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <i>If a Papiſt be falſe and deceitful, yet Euge, &amp;c.</i>   | p. 49. |
| <i>No man can be a Papiſt but he that's blinded by Education,</i>  |        |
| <i>&amp;c.</i>   | P. 50. |
| <i>About Piſturing the Divinity,</i>   | ibid.  |
| <i>Of Praying to an Image,</i>   | P. 52. |
| <i>Of Worſhipping Bread and Wine as God,</i>   | P. 53. |
| <i>Of the Paſſion of Chriſt taking away the guilt and not the</i><br><span style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>puniſhment,</i></span>                          | ibid.  |
| <i>Of the Non-neceſſity of Repentance till the point of death,</i>   | ibid.  |
| <i>Bare ſaying of Prayers without attendance to what they ſay,</i><br><span style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>is ſufficient to Divine Acceptance,</i></span> | P. 54. |
| <i>Of Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, and the Translation of</i><br><span style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>the Maſs-Book,</i></span>                          | P. 55. |

### Character XIV.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>They take away the ſecond Commandment,</i>   | p. 56. |
| <i>'Tis not neceſſary to be ſorry for the ſin, but the penance,</i>   |        |
|   | P. 57. |
| <i>An Indulgence ſerves inſtead of a Godly life,</i>  | ibid.  |
| <i>Auricular Confeſſion the great Intelligencer,</i>  | p. 58. |
| <i>Ignorance the Mother of Devotion,</i>  | ibid.  |
| <i>They muſt ſubmit to an Infallible Judg, ſo as to believe Ver-</i><br><span style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>ture to be bad, and Vice good,</i></span> | p. 59. |
| <i>Their Clergy muſt lead a ſingle life, whether honeſtly or no,</i><br><span style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>it makes no matter,</i></span>            | p. 60. |
| <i>Of the ſeveral Artiſices uſed by our Author,</i>   | p. 64. |
| <i>Of his Reply to the Anſwerer of his Reflections,</i>   | p. 65. |
|   | Hh     |

## The Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>His appeal to the Lives of Papists amongst us, shew'd to be impertinent,</i>  | ibid.      |
| <i>A further Account of his Artifice,</i>  | p. 67.     |
| <i>His Answers all along insufficient,</i>   | p. 70.     |
| <i>Of his insincerity in the offers he makes to receive us into his Church upon the Representing Terms, and detesting some Principles and Practices charged upon the Church of Rome,</i> | p. 71, 72. |

---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**Ransubstantiation contrary to Scripture ; or the Protestant's Answer to the Seeker's Request.

The Protestant's Answer to the Catholick Letter to the Seeker : Or, a Vindication of the Protestant's Answer, to the Seeker's Request.

An Apology for the Pulpits ; being in Answer to a late Book, Intituled, *Good Advice to the Pulpits*. Together with an Appendix, containing a Defence of Dr. Tenison's Sermon about Alms ; in a Letter to the Author of the Apology.

---

## ERRATA.

**P**Ag. 42. l. 5. r. 15. p. 33. l. 35. r. in terminis. p. 41. l. 6. a bringing. p. 43. l. 2. r. faith be.

Pulpit-POPERY, True POPERY:

IN

ANSWER

TO

Pulpit - Sayings.

WHEN the Author of the *Pulpit-Sayings* first appeared in the World, he undertook to shew what the Papist is not, or how he is Misrepresented; and what he really is, and how he is to be Represented. The first, he tells us, *He exactly describ'd according to the Apprehension he had, when a Protestant*: And the latter he represents according to his own private Opinion, when a Papist, as he is told. So that in the issue the whole is resolv'd into himself. Thus it was, and thus he still maintains the Humour; for what are the Characters he gives of a Papist, but for the most part, the fruits of his own Imagination? And what doth he bring to confirm it, but, *it is the Papist I am*? What course doth he take to confute his Adversaries, to confront their Authorities, but, *if that be a Papist, I am none, I profess I renounce such Popery*. Nay, as if he acted *sub sigillo Piscatoris*, and had by Deputation the Authority of the Chair, to determine and renounce; and the Keys of St. Peter to bind and loose, to let in and out of their Communion, as he sees fit; he assures us, that *whoever will be a good Papist, must disclaim every point that is here set down by the Pulpits as Articles of Religion*. And again the Papist Represented *I own it, it's the Papist I am; and whoever assents to that*

Papist Mitr.  
repr. pref.  
Doctr. and  
Pract. p. 11.

Pulpit-Sayings, p. 55.  
Epist. to the Reader.

Ibid.

P. 55.

B

Character

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

*Character in that very Form [of the Papist Represented] has done what is required, as to those particulars, to be made a Member of our Communion.*

So that if I declare, I profess I renounce on one side; and I am, I do own, on the other, is sufficient to determine the Point, and will be taken for an Answer by his Adversaries, there is no more to be said.

P. 55.

But though our Author may suitably enough to the temper of the Church he is now of, be thus assuming and dogmatical, and may for ought we know, thus expound, transform, and determine with Allowance; yet there is no reason why he should prescribe to the Church he has forsaken, and that his *Apprehensions* be taken for the Apprehensions of all of that Communion. This he now thinks a little unreasonable, and could be content for once to own it, if his present Undertaking be allowed to come in the place of it. For thus he saith, *If any make Exceptions against the Character of a Papist thus disguis'd, as 'twas drawn there, [in the Papist Misrepresented] I'll never quarrel upon that score, let that be raz'd out.*—

To the Reader.

But however, tho he thus drops his own *Apprehensions*, (as well as he had his 37. Points of Representation) and at once gives away half his Labour; yet like a true Master of Defence, he mounts the Stage again, and renews the Fight; for by the help of some *Pulpit-Sayings*, he thinks he has given life to his otherwise dying Cause. *Let that*, saith he, *be raz'd out, and these others take place, which 'tis likely are more Authentick.* What! more *Authentick* than his own *Apprehensions*! O yes, for *its* such a Popery, and such a Papist as is describ'd by Ministers in their Pulpits.—*In which there are many things charged upon them, without either Truth and Sincerity; and consequently, 'tis not without grounds they complain of Misrepresenting.*

1. But why the Pulpits? Are not the same things in Books of Controversy; and are they not there more fully explain'd and debated? Thither therefore in reason we ought to be sent to understand how the Protestants Represent the Papist. But then our Author had not had the opportunity of exclaiming against those *high Places* (as he Phrases it) from whence, it seems, they have received no little Damage; or which is worse, he had been engaged in a Dispute, which is not his *Prerogative*, as he tells us (p. 28.)

2. But



2. But if some Pulpits have misrepresented them in some cases, what is that to the Pulpits in general? What is that to our Church? He has been already told, that *we are far from defending such Misrepresentations, if such there be. That which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Sense of our Church, as it is by Law established; and what Representations are made agreeable thereto, we undertake to defend, and no other.* Can he think we are any more concern'd in the mistakes or infirmities of others, then he thinks himself to be in the loose and extravagant opinions of their own Doctors, Schoolmen, and Casuists? And is it not reasonable he should allow the same Law to others he is forced so frequently to plead in his own defence?

Doctr. and  
Pract. p 9, 10.

To the Reader;  
and p. 36.

3. But further, supposing that some of the Pulpits have Misrepresented the Papist in some points, and in those points he disclaims; yet are there no points besides they differ in? And if these were set aside, would the Church of *England* and *Rome* be one? What thinks he of the many points I find in the same Sermons he quotes, that he civilly passes by? Such as these, That the Church of *Rome* is alone the Catholick Church out of which is no Salvation. That the Pope is the Universal Head of that Church. That that Church is Infallible? What thinks he of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Communion in one kind, Divine Service and Scriptures in an Unknown Tongue, Merit and Works of Supererogation, the Worship of Images; Implicit Faith, Indulgences, Deposition of Princes, &c? Lastly, What thinks he of the great point he all along omitted (as he is charged) that a *Papist* doth not only believe the Doctrines defin'd in the Council of Trent to be true, but also to be necessary to Salvation? Are not these the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*? And are not the Pulpits as much employ'd in confuting these, as those of praying to Images, and putting their trust in them, and the other Follies and Abominations (as he calls them) charged on his Church? And do not the Protestants think as ill of those points he owns, as of those he disclaims?

Doctr. and  
Pract. p. 12.

4. But how come they of the Church of *Rome* to start this charge of Misrepresentation, who are of all Churches in the world the most guilty of it? Or how comes our Author to continue it, who neither durst so much as vindicate others or himself when convicted of it? The learned Author of the *View* enter'd the Field, and threw down the Gantlet, but our Author fairly sinks aside, and leaves his Brethren to sink under the imputation of

View, p. 106.  
to 119.

# Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

P. 61. 102,  
103.

To the Reader.

Pulpit Say-  
ings, p. 10.

Good Advice  
to the Pulpits  
p. 67.  
Apology for  
the Pulpits,  
p. 3.

Pulpit Say-  
ings, p. 43.

Page 6.

the foulest Misrepresentations. And this is not to be wonder'd at, when he has not one word of Reply to all the Accusations of that kind there produced against himself. And yet to give a further Specimen how far this disingenuous quality has prevail'd upon his temper, he still proceeds in the same course, and to be quit with the Pulpits, which he saith, are *forward in making characters of the Papijts*, he is as forward in making characters of the Pulpits. *The business of so many Pulpits* [ten thousand open every week he saith] *is chiefly to make exceptions, pick holes, quarrel, ridicule : and the more excellent they are at their work, the more they gain upon their Auditory.* And that he may not be wanting, he will be at his Plots too, and follow what he calls *Oat's Divine* way of Information. He had tried once before to form a design of this kind, when he would have Sermons preach'd many years ago against Popery to contain *severe reflections* upon his present Majesty. But that he was soon made sensible of, and has not a syllable to excuse. And yet he will be again at his *Innuendo's*, for thus he lays the Scene, *Methinks the Pulpits*, saith he, *should be more tender of their Sovereign than to venture upon the same Method* (which he before charges them with) *with the Son, which prov'd so fatal to the Father, and dangerous to the Brother. But I fear the excess of jealousy for their Religion, puts them upon being too bold with their Prince ; and that by a just judgment of Heaven, they are blindly practising the very principles they have so often charged upon the Papijts, making their Churches Interest the center of their Religion, Preaching Faction instead of Faith, &c.*

Such expressions as these are not thrown out at all adventure ; and we may soon guess what they tend to, and it's a *fair warning*.

Thus far for the Pulpits ; but to shew what a Talent he has at Character-making, he will furnish us also with that of the *true Son of the Church of England*, viz. *A Genuine Son of the Church of England*, is to have a good stock of this implicit Faith by him, and to believe and speak, though he knows nothing at all.

Again, *This is to the Protestant Tune*, *If a man can't tell how to run down Popery, though he knows nothing of it, he's no true Son of the Church of England.* So that quarrelling and ridiculing is the work it seems of the Preachers, and a delight in it, the temper of their Auditors ; and to speak all at once, Ignorance and Arrogance, Slander and Impudence are in his opinion the Ingredients of a true Son of the Church of England. This is the faithful

Re-

Representer, the soft Adviser, the prudent Cautioner, the impartial Character-maker, the Preacher of Charity, the Detector of Impostures and disguisements, and the great undertaker of setting every thing upon its proper Basis, and bringing it into its true place and order.

5. But what if after all, this *Pulpit-Popery* is true Popery; and that nothing is charged upon them as a Principle, but what the Pulpits learn'd from themselves?

But, *says some Body*, hold your hand, and make no such attempt; for can that be done after all his *Detestations, Renouncings, Disclaimings, Abhorring, and Abominatings*? Does not he declare that *these Doctrines as here set down by the Ministers*, and charged upon the Papists, he not only *abominates*, but that if that so to believe, be a Papist, *he would be a Turk as soon as a Papist*.

To the Reader.

Page 54.

But these *Rhodomantado's* come so often in, that I perceive they are words of course with him; and shall therefore file them up with his *Anathema's* in his *Papist Represented and Misrepresented*, till I find due place for a further Animadversion; and so pass on to the Examination of this his Vindication of his *Good Advice to the Pulpits*. For the better grace of which his performance, he has distributed his matter into fourteen Characters of a *Pulpit-Papist*.

But what's become of the former method observed in his *Good Advice*? What of the five Cautions? What of the twenty-eight Assertions extracted out of the Sermons, as instances of their foul Misrepresentations? Certainly had he in earnest intended to have given a just Answer to his Adversary, or was conscious to himself of having performed it, he would have kept as much as might be to his former Method, which the Apologist carefully followed him in, that the whole might lye fair before the Reader's eye, and he might lay his finger upon the point in debate betwixt them. But that was not to his purpose; he thought he might give the matter a more clever turn, if he slid off from his Cautions and Assertions, and dispos'd the whole into Characters. Assertions are dangerous points, and require proof and debate; and it would be expected the matter should in that way be brought to an issue. But for Characters, a Writer may go on eternally, it requires only a little skill in Representation, and the work is done. And it requires but a spark of confidence to tell his Reader that he *proceeds to this Examen* [of the Apology] *in the*

Pulpit-Saying, Page 13.

Method

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Ibid. Chara-  
cter, 1, 2, 3,  
4, 5. p. 13,  
&c.

P. 5.

To the Rea-  
der.

*Method of the Good Advice to the Pulpits*, and presently his Characters fall back into Cautions and Assertions, by the Figure of making two things to be one, and of denying and affirming without a contradiction. But if he will be at his Characters, how come particular matters of Fact to belong to a Character? Or how is it that what belongs to a particular sort, is applied to the whole? Would it not be very ridiculous to describe a Papist after the way taken by our Author, and to tell the world, A Papist is one that was engaged in an execrable Plot to take away the Life of his late Majesty. A Papist is one, that had a Hand in the Horrid Plot of the Murder of King Charles the First. A Papist is one that fired London. A Papist is one that has his Emissaries up and down to preach Schism and Seditiō. A Papist is one, What? why, the different Orders of Religion are so many Sets of Religion. And yet, thus it must be, if Characters are Characters. Did ever the Pulpits talk at this loose and senseless rate, so as to draw Characters from a particular Fact? And might it not as well be said, A Papist is one that writes Representations, and Good Advices, and Pulpit-Sayings? This is a way peculiar to our Author, for ought I have observed, among Writers of Characters; and I'll assure him he was very secure, when he offered this Proposal, *Let them take this Pulpit-draught along with them, and compare it with all the Papists they know, or can hear of; let them see, whether they answer that Character.* Would it not be more proper if we were to give the Character of a Papist, and will proceed upon Particulars, to resolve them into a General, and to see whether, for example, they have not such Principles in the Church of Rome, as not only have put them upon, but do oblige them to some Practices too near a kin to some of these before spoken of: And for an instance of which I shall refer him to *Doctrines and Practices*, p. 102 and 103, and to a Papist not misrepresented, p. 49. Now the producing the Anathema's of his Church against these Points, and an Authoritative Abrenunciation of them, would do more to remove the occasion of our so many years Disturbances, and to wipe off the Scandals urged against them from the Pulpit, or elsewhere, than all the Tracts that he has published; and is as much a Satisfaction they owe to the World, as any he would prescribe to the Pulpits in his first Character: when we hear of this, I dare assure him there shall be no want in the other. But however 'tis but reasonable to give him the hearing.

First

*First Character of a Pulpit-Papist.*

*The Papists in the Year 1679. &c. were engaged in a Horrid Execrable Plot, &c.*

*In these Colours, saith he, were the Papists set out by the Pulpits. And why not set out by the King, Lords and Commons in Parliament? Why not by the Highest Courts of Judicature? Did the Pulpits take the Depositions and Examinations? Did the Pulpits set forth Proclamations? Did the Pulpits pass Votes, and make Acts, and sign Narratives? Did the Pulpits Try, Condemn, and Execute? Did the Pulpits, lastly, ordain Fasts, and require publick Solemnities to be observed? Or are the Pulpits to enquire into all Facts, and to give no Credit to the Reports, or no Obedience to the Orders of Superiors concerning them? If this was the case of the Pulpits, then the Title of this his Chapter would not be amiss; but he knows for what reasons it better deserves another; and in reason ought to be the Character of a — Papist.*

*Second Character of a Pulpit-Papist.*

*The Popish Jesuits had a hand in that horrid Plot of the Murder of King Charles I. &c.*

But if it were *Popish Jesuits* that were thus challenged by the Pulpits, then why is the Title, the *Character of a Pulpit-Papist*? Since I hope all the Practices of the Jesuits can no more be charged upon the Papist, than every Papist will be content to be a Jesuit. And therefore it's very wide from the *Sayer's* purpose, to shew this to be impossible, because of the *Nobility, Gentry, and Commonalty*, that fought and lost their Lives in Defence of his Majesty. For it has been no strange thing for many of all Conditions to go one way, and yet the Jesuit to go another. The times of *Henry 3. and 4. of France*, will give us instances enough of this matter. I could wish that he had kept the Challenge to himself, for having made it, he has made it necessary to answer it. It's this, *The Challenge has been made to all sorts of Protestants*, P. 16. *to produce even Ten Papists, I may say Two, that in all that Confusion of Civil Wars, ever drew Sword against him.* I shall not here offer him the Instances of *Capt. Tho. Preston*, and *Capt. Wright*, mentioned.



*Fox's &c.* oned in *Foxes and Firebrands*, both because they served under  
*Part 2. p. 88.* *Oliver*; and also, because it's one of his *Street-Pamphlets* (as he  
*and 91.* calls them) but shall lay before him undeniable Authorities.

*Exact. Col-* Such is that of the Royal Martyr himself, who in a Declaration  
*lect. p. 647.* of his, saith, *All men know the great number of Papists which serve*  
*Lond. 1643.* *in their Army, Commanders and others. We are confident a far greater*

*L' Histoire* The other shall be that of *Rob. Mentet de Salmonet*, a Secular Priest,  
*des Troubles* who in his History of the Troubles of England, saith, That at  
*de la Grand* the Battel of *Edge-hill*, several Priests were found slain on the Parlia-  
*Bretagne. P.* ment side: For although in their Declarations they called the King's  
*165.* Army, a Popish Army, thereby to render ir odious to the people; yet  
 they had in their Army two Companies of Walloons, and other Roman-  
 Catholicks. The Book perhaps may not lye in every ones way;  
 but the passage is transcribed into *Sir William Dugdale's View of*  
*the late Troubles in England, P. 564. An. 1642.*

As for the Authority of the French-Precacher, let it be as it will;  
 but I think it would have been a greater satisfaction to the  
 World, if they had accepted his Challenge Printed and Reprint-  
 ed, and questioned him for it when alive, rather than after his  
 death, to appeal to Protestants whether it be not a Fable.

### Third Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*The Papists were the Instruments in the Fire of London, &c.*

This he charges upon the Preacher as an Aggravation of  
 his Misrepresentation, That he should vent this almost Twenty years  
 after, [ 1683 ] when the whole matter had been thoroughly consider'd:  
 And tho there were no other grounds whereon to build this charge, be-  
 sides the clamour and affected jealousies of the people, and the confession  
 of a distracted man, whose Religion was not much of any kind, but  
 still professedly a Protestant; Yet upon these grounds, &c. I am not  
 so well acquainted with the History of this, as to know when  
 this whole matter was thoroughly consider'd; And it's likely the  
 Preacher was as ignorant as I am: Nor do I know upon what  
 grounds he proceeded; but tho it might be (as our Author  
 saith) That the distracted Man's Religion was not much of any kind,  
 yet I have been assured upon good grounds, that he did not  
 dye a Protestant.



## *in Answer to Pulpit-Sayings.*

9

### Fourth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*The Papists have their Emissaries up and down to preach Schism and Sedition into the Peoples ears. By such Arts as these, they insinuate themselves among the poor deluded People of our separate Congregations, and joyning with them in their Clamours against the Church of England, crying it down for Superstitious, and Popishly affected, they pass for gifted Brethren, and real Popery is carry'd on by such Disguises.*

Here our Author first of all inveighs against the thing, and then against the Pulpits for charging it upon them. Here, saith he, *the Papists are set forth in a Sermon before the Honourable the Judges, as great Hypocrites, Religious Cheats and Impostors. — A foul Crime! and if true, sufficient to cast the Papists [he should say, such Spiritual Factors] out of the number of Christians; but if false, and not as here set out, as sufficient on the other side, to bring the Pulpits under that as black Character of Misrepresenting. This is indeed to come up to the point, and I shall readily close with him upon it.*

The Apologist to shorten his Work, and to take down the Confidence of the *Adviser* without bearing too hard upon the Party, contented himself with pointing his Adversary to three or four Authors for Information in this Case; such as the *Quaker Unmask'd*, the *New Discovery*, the *false Jew*, and *Foxes and Firebrands*. Now to this he replies, *Who would not have expected that the Answerer would have spent a few Lines in making good such Authorities, and proving them to be Authentick beyond Exception? —* And then after his manner, breaks forth into a wonderful Exclamation, *Good God! that Men should pretend to teach their Auditory the Gospel, and when they are thus challenged in a particular of this Moment, then to fly to Foxes and Firebrands, and laying by the Scripture, take Refuge in Libels and Street-Pamphlets! Now who would not have expected that he would have spent a few Lines in disproving these Authorities? If he could have done this; he had done somewhat; but it's easier to call a thing a Libel, than to prove it. Well! What is the proof he expects? That it be Authentick beyond Exception? But when shall it pass for Authentick beyond Exception? Nothing less, it seems, than Scripture, is sufficient. For, saith he, when they are thus challenged, laying by the*

C

*Scripture,*

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

*Scripture, they take refuge in Libels and Street-Pamphlets.* Here I must ingenuously confess, that we are at a loss, and that we read no more in the Scripture of such Emissaries, as *Faithful Commin*, and *Thomas Heth*, than he does of the *Miracles of Xaverius*, or the *Revelations of St. Bridget*, and the *Extasies of Magdalen de Pazzi*. But did ever any man in the World, before our Author, put a case upon this issue, and require Scripture-proof for matters of Fact, or charge his Adversary with *laying aside Scripture*, because he brings not Scripture to prove it?

But supposing they have as good Authority, as what they can produce for the *Legends* of their Church; will it not be as *Authentick*? Let us therefore proceed (as he calls it) to the *Examen*. The first Book (which he has a particular pique against) is what is call'd *Foxes and Firebrands*; which is full of Relations of this kind. There we read of one *Faithful Commin*, a *Dominican*, who (in the year 1567. came over to *England*, pretending to be a Protestant) refused to be present at the Prayers of the Church, alledging that they were but the *Mass translated*; had a separate Congregation, prayed for hours together with much Groaning, and many Tears; and in his Sermons, spoke as much against *Rome*, and her Pope, as any of the Clergy (as he pleaded before the Queen and Council.) And yet all this while acted a part, to delude the People, and do Service to his Church.

This Narrative is an Extract out of the Memorials of the Lord Cecil, and was transmitted to Bishop *Usher*; and among his Papers came into the hands of Sir *James Ware*, late one of His Majesties Privy Council in *Ireland*, and published by his Son *Robert Ware*, Esq;.

*Ibid.* p. 31, &c.

The Copy of this was taken out of the Registry of the Episcopal See of Rochester.

In the next year 1568. there was another of our Author's *Impostors* detected, *Thomas Heth* a Jesuit, who pretended much to spiritual Prayers, declaiming against Set-Forms; and when brought before the Bishop of Rochester, said he thereby endeavoured to make Religion the purer, — and that he laboured to refine the Protestants, and to take off all smacks of Ceremonies, that in the least do tend to the *Romish Faith*; and the better to conceal himself, spoke against the Jesuits, and declared that he was fallen from that Society. And yet all this while was as much theirs, as ever, and did all by Allowance. For he was discovered by a Letter drop'd out of his Pocket in the Pulpit at Rochester, and written from one *Samuel Malt* a Jesuit of Note; which, after Directions given to him, how

how to govern himself in these matters, thus concludes: *This we have certified to the Council and Cardinals, That there is no other way to prevent People from turning Hereticks, and for the recalling of others back again to the Mother Church, than by the Diversities of Doctrines.* There was besides, found in his Boots, a License from the Jesuits, and a Bull dated the first of *Pius Quintus*, to teach what Doctrine that Society pleased, for the dividing of Protestants. And in his Trunk were several Books for denying Baptism to Infants, &c. This was a Cause openly heard, and he openly punish'd for it; and in our Author's Opinion very deservedly; for as he well observes upon this occasion, *The Dissimulation and Delusion be abominable every where, yet never more than in spiritual Matters, and concerns of the Soul.*

Pulpit-Sayings, Pag. 20.

So much for this Book, and its Authority. Proceed we to the next, the *False Jew*; this Book contains the History of one *Thomas Ramsey*, Son to Doctor Ramsey, Phylician to the King, who being bred up in the Jesuits College in Rome, and well instructed in the Hebrew Tongue, was sent forth, and became a pretended Jew under the name of *Joseph Ben Israel* (having been also Circumcised) and coming for England, at Newcastle professed himself a Christian Convert; but soon struck in among the *Anabaptists*, and was baptized by them at *Hexham*. The whole cause, after the Discovery, was heard before *H. Dawson* the Mayor, 1653, where this was partly prov'd against him, and partly confest. The Narrative was published by the Ministers of Newcastle at that time.

The two other Books, *The Quaker Unmask'd*, and the *New Discovery*, were publish'd by Mr. Pryn 1656. In which he gives an account of one *Coppinger* a *Franciscan*, that with others of the same Order were chief Speakers among the *Quakers*; this was deposed upon Oath. If our Author is curious this way, I shall soon furnish him with other Authentick Testimonies of this kind: But I suppose this may be more than he desires: For if this be true, how will he reconcile this to Christianity? and who are they that in his opinion deserve to be cast out of the number of Christians? As for his long Excursion about Legends, I shall reserve it to its proper place.

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

### Fifth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*The different Orders of Religion amongst the Papists, are neither better nor worse than so many Sects, and several Casts of Religion ; only they have that advantage in managing their Divisions, which we have not ; to pack up their Fanaticks in Convents and Cloysters, and so bring them under some kind of Rule and Government.*

Here the *Apologist* had charged the *Adviser* with a Falsification, but he is so kind to himself as to pass it over, and truly so will the *Apologist* in consideration of the kindness he hath now done, in giving him a further account of the Sermon here quoted, which (for want of direction as to Author or Bookseller) he could not procure. *The Preacher being desirous, saith our Author, to take off that foul blemish of so many Sects and Divisions rending the Protestant Church (it seems there is now in his opinion another Church) of England inconsistent with the unity of Christ's true Church, and so often objected against them by Catholicks, falls into that common Topick of covering the defects of his own Church, by calumniating that of his Neighbour, and therefore he boldly makes up to his Auditory, and tells them, That the Unity the Papists boast of in their Communion, is but a pretence, whereas they have really more Divisions in their Religion, than they charge ours with ; and then goes on in the words of the Character above cited.*

Out of this Discourse of the Preacher, our Author draws three Particulars, pag. 27.

1. *That in the Church of Rome there are more Divisions than they charge ours with.*

2. *That their Religious Orders are neither better nor worse than so many Sects and several Casts of Religion.*

3. *That they have their Fanaticks packt up in Convents.*

And he should have added another from the *Apology*,

4. *That thus to pack them up in Convents, is an advantage their Church makes of it.*

Our Author having thus drawn out the sense of the Preacher, and made what he will of the sense of the *Apologist*, concludes, *He must give me leave to set down these three Assertions of the Pulpit for so many clear Instances of most foul Misrepresenting.* But by his leave I shall review his account of this matter. I am not obliged in strictness to concern my self in the first Head, being neither charged upon

upon the Preacher in the *Good Advice*, nor so much as mentioned in the *Apology*; but yet he shall find me a fair Adversary, and not willing to stand upon my Terms, but take the work as he has cut it out for me.

1. *The Unity the Papists boast of, is but a pretence; whereas they have really more Divisions in their Religion than they charge ours with.* This our Author saith is a *Calumniating* of them; and is one of his *Foul Misrepresentations*. And yet after all, I doubt it will return upon himself: For if there be a real and perfect Union, it's surely to be seen in their present obedience to the same Church-Authority, as our Author words it, pag. 26. or in a perfect Union of Members among themselves, in charity. Or in being of the same belief, as our Author suggests. And yet if we come to examine it in this Method, we shall find Breach upon Breach. For,

(1.) What Schisms have there been in that Church-Authority? no less than thirty (as *Onuphrius* reckons) in the Papacy, some of which continued ten, some twenty, and one fifty years?

(2.) What actual Disobediences to that Authority in the times of *Innocent 4th. Urban 8th.* and at this season are in the *Gallican Church*?

(3.) What infinite Quarrels betwixt the Bishops and the Friers, the Friers and Parish-Priests, in the times of *Gregory 9th. Innocent 4th. Alexander 4th. Martin 4th. Boniface 8. Clement 5th. Benedict 10th. &c.* from age to age, even to that infamous one in the last age here betwixt the Seculars and Regulars? One Pope revoking anothers Decrees, and oftentimes annulling their own, as did *Innocent, Martin and Boniface, &c.*

(4.) Come we to their Union in Doctrine, and we shall find that but a *pretence*. For where have there been sharper conflicts than among them about the Seat and Extent of Infallibility, Predetermination, and the Immaculate Conception, &c? Each charging the other with Heresie: as the *Jesuits* and *Jansenists* about the First; the *Dominicans* and *Jesuits* about the second; the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans* about the third. Thus far therefore we are not agreed with our Author; for if actual and material Divisions betwixt Head and Head, Head and Members, Members and Members, will make a plea to Union to be but a *pretence*, then so it is with them.

2. *Their Religious Orders are neither better nor worse than so many Sects and Casts of Religion.* This, saith our Author, is an absolute Falshood;



## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

*Falsbood*; and the *Vindicator* that undertakes to defend the Preacher, is in his opinion no better than a *vain Trifler*, in publishing such an idle *Apology*. But why so? Because when the Preacher had said, that the Orders among the Papists are so many *Seſts*, the account he gives of it is, that they are so many distinct Bodies, that having different Founders, Rules, Habits, and Opinions, by which an Emulation is begot betwixt Order and Order, they become divided among themselves, and when occasion is offer'd, do actually war upon one another in their way. Now, saith our Author, would not a School-boy have been scourged for such a *steevels's* frivolous excuse? which he saith, may be as well applied to our Colleges in the Universities, as to their Convents. But was this all the Apologist undertook? and did he thus conclude his defence of the Preacher?

When he had thus shewn what is meant by their Orders, and how Emulations and Quarrels might arise, and what occasions were given for them in point of Rules, Habits and Opinions, did he not proceed to shew of what sort these Differences were in the very next words after those quoted by the *Sayer*? Surely he might in his Transports have so far condescended, as to touch upon those points, and shewed a little of his skill in proving the Differences betwixt the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans* about the *Immaculate Conception*, to have been no other than a *School-opinion* in our Colleges; and that notwithstanding all the Feuds betwixt the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans* and the *Jesuits*, there mentioned, they are (as he would have it) only different parts, not dividing but making up the whole. He complains of the Preacher that he so worded it, that no Protestant of his Auditory but must receive this Notion, that as in England, so likewise in the Church of Rome, there are different *Seſts* of Religion, and Fanaticks to divide it. And let any Protestant or other read the History of their long contentions about the size of their Hoods, and the *Immaculate Conception*, and he will read a notable Comment upon the Preacher's words, and see that he has not misrepresented them. I would fain know of our Author what he thinks of a Controversie that hath filled Kingdoms, Cities, Universities, Cloysters, with Tumults and Disorders; Pulpits and Schools with contentions, Invectives and Revilings; that hath concerned Kings, Popes and Councils in composing; and at last grew to that height, that after 300 years bickerings, Popes themselves, though solicited from time to time not only by the Heads of the Faction, but by Princes



Princes themselves, yet either could not, or thought it not safe and adviseable to determine it?

Let me sum it up in the Words of the King of Spain's Embassador to the Pope, to move him to come to a Resolution upon it. *Consider the loss of many Souls, the Discord of the Church, the Dissensions of Cities, the great Dangers that hang over the Kingdom.* Let our Author consider this, and tell me for what reason he took no notice of this case laid before him, or how he could, after he had read it, charge the Preacher with an *absolute Falshood*?

Legatio Philippi, 3. and 4. Paulo 5. & Gregor. 15. per Luc. Wadding. p. 89.

For this, I shall refer him further to a late Book call'd, *The Virgin Mary Misrepresented by the Roman Church*, §. 3, and 4.

But here our Author relieves himself, That this *may be seen in the Queen Dowager's Chappel, in which officiate Monks, Friars, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Clergy, that is, so many different Orders of Men, and yet without any difference in Religion, or disagreement in Faith.* But will he say, there are no differences between the Friars and Dominicans, the Jesuits and the Clergy in those Cases, when they charge each other with Heresy? or because they seem to agree, or do there agree, there is then nothing of this between Order and Order? This is much such an Argument, as if one that had seen the Fox and the Sheep, and other Creatures quietly sitting upon one and the same Hill in the *West*, when drove thither by a sudden Inundation, should from thence conclude, and would persuade others to believe that these were all at a perfect Accord, and that there was no Enmity in their Nature, nor had ever been in Fact. I shall conclude this with what Antoninus, A. B. of Florence, saith in this case. *Let every one take heed of preaching on this matter [the immaculate Conception] before the People, with a charge upon the contrary Party, because it's Scandalous to the People;* and accordingly it was forbidden by several Popes.

Another of the *Falshoods* charged upon the Preacher is, the asserting, *they have Fanaticks pack'd up in their Convents.* The best Answer I can give to the Sayer upon this, is to set before the Reader, an account of the Method taken by the Apologist in handling this Argument.

1. Who shew'd "what Fanaticism is, and that it's a general Name, comprehending in it Superstition and Enthusiasm. "The former is the placing Religion in those things, which Religion is not concerned in. The latter is when Persons are "acted and governed by some suppos'd Communications from  
† "Heaven,

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

"Heaven, by Revelations, Visions, Inspirations, by Raptures  
"and Illuminations, and unaccountable Impulses.

2. He shew'd there was such Fanaticism amongst them, and in their Convents; of the former sort, he instanced in their Monkish Orders, Habits, Rules and Privileges granted to them, and depended upon. To which our Author gives not one word of Reply.

To the latter [*Enthusiasm*] the Apologist refers.

(1.) The Institution of their Orders, which with their Rules they say, were first instituted by the Holy Ghost.

(2.) Many of their Doctrines, as *Purgatory, Transubstantiation, and the Immaculate Conception, &c.*

(3.) Many of the things defined and observed in the Church, as Sacraments, Festivals, Canonizations, &c. for which they plead Revelation.

3. He shewed further, that these Revelations, were only *suppos'd*, not truly so. And that 1. Because it derogates from Divine Revelation. And 2. Because they agree not amongst themselves. Of which there is given a notorious Instance in the case of the Immaculate Conception, where Revelation is pleaded on both sides; and each side charges the other with Imposture about it.

But here our Author is wholly silent. However something must be said upon this Head, and that amounts to this.

1. That *those in Convents in the Church of Rome embrace a retired Life, dedicate themselves to the Service of God, in Praying, Fasting, &c. some according to the Institution of St. Benedict, others of St. Francis, &c.* And what follows? therefore they are not Fanaticks, therefore they are not Superstitious and Enthusiasts, that is, they are not Fanaticks, because they are not. Surely no Fanatick could have fallen into this account, without the assistance of such a Representer.

2. He adds, *Religious men in Convents, are Fanaticks, forsooth, because they are acted by some suppos'd Revelations, Visions, Raptures, &c. What Controversial Stuff is this! Why at this rate, he might make Fanaticks of all the Patriarchs and Prophets, of St. Joseph, St. Peter, and St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles; and most of all St. John, whose whole Book of Revelation, is nothing now, it seems, but so much Fanaticism.* Surely our Author is here driven to some Extremity, when he has no other Refuge, but by making the  
Case

Case in dispute betwixt us parallel with the Case of the Prophets and Apostles; and that when the *Apologist* calls those of the *Romish Church*, *Supposed Revelations, Visions and Raptures*, it's as Criminal as if he had said as much of the Divine Writers. At this rate, saith he, *he might make Fanaticks of all the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles*. At what rate? What, because he saith those pretended to in the Church of Rome are *supposed*? will it follow therefore that those of the Prophets and Apostles are *supposed* too? No surely, no more than it will follow, because the Revelations of the Prophets and Apostles are Divine, therefore those alledged in the Church of Rome are Divine also. Our Author saith of the *Apologists* account of Fanaticism, *What Controversial stuff is this!* But I may with good reason return it, *What impious stuff is this!* that will make the Inspirations of *Magdalen of Pazzi*, and the Revelations of *St. Bridget*, and *Catharine of Siena* (how fond and contradictory soever) to stand upon the same foundation with the Revelations of *St. John*: And those which some of their own Authors call *Humane Dreams, Fantastick Visions*, and others call *Impostures*, to be as much from God, as the Visions of *Ezekiel*, and the Dream of *Joseph*, &c.

4. That the Church of Rome disposes her Fanaticks into Convents for advantage, is another Charge produced against them by the Preacher, and insisted upon by the *Apologist*; but that our Author, for reasons best known to himself, left as he found it.

Sixth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*In the Roman Church the Sacrament must now be no longer a Representative, but a Real Propitiatory Sacrifice; And Christ's Natural Body must be brought down upon a Thousand Altars at once, and there Really broken—and his Blood actually spilt a Thousand times every day.* Here the *Apologist* charges our Author with altering the sense of the Preacher, when he makes the Preacher to declare that was a positive Assertion of the Papists, which was an Argument and Consequence of the Preacher's from their Assertion; and that for this purpose he had left out the words *Now*, and *must be*, that were the Indications of it. All that our Author has to reply to this Charge is, that it's a *Nice point the Vindicator is reduced to, to bring off the Preacher*: But it's not so *Nice* as 'tis evident that our Author's account of it is a *Foul Misrepresentation*. If the

Char. 6.

Preacher had charged it as a Doctrine own'd by the Papists, then so far as they disown it, it had been a Misrepresentation; but as it's an Argument against them (as it's plain it was) then it's no more a Misrepresentation, than it's false, and that belongs not to Representation, but Dispute. And therefore so far as an Argument of the Preacher against the Papists, differs from a Concession and Assertion of the Papists, so far has our Author misrepresented the Preacher; when he saith, *That the Protestants awkward Reasoning is set out for their Doctrine.* Well, at length however it shall be own'd for Reasoning and Inference; and though it's not his Province (he saith) to examine the truth of such Reasoning, yet he fancies that 'tis easily reconcilable with Reason and Scripture, and so intelligible—*that the Sacrifice of the Altar is Representative of that upon the Cross:* That is, if he will speak to the purpose, That though the Sacrament be a Real and Propitiatory Sacrifice, yet it's still Representative. But how will he prove it? His Argument is this, *Christ really present in the Sacrament may be offer'd to God upon the Altar by the Hands of the Priest, in Remembrance of the same Christ offering himself a Victim upon the Cross for the Redemption of man: and consequently, the Sacrifice of the Altar is Representative of that upon the Cross.* Where I would only ask him, what is the difference betwixt Christ's being really present in the Sacrament when offer'd, and the Sacrifice of the Altar? What again is the difference 'twixt the being offer'd in Remembrance of Christ's offering himself upon the Cross, and the Representative of that upon the Cross; and consequently, whether he has not proved what he intended after this manner, that the Sacrifice of the Altar is Representative of that upon the Cross, because it's Representative? Methinks he might have shewn some little respect, when he is on the Arguing part, to what the *Apologist* had offer'd against this.

But however, though his Argument may signifie little, yet he hopes Mr. *Thorndike's* may be of some Authority, *who*, he saith, *never scrupled the least at this; expressly owning the [Elements changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, to be truly the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and to be both Propitiatory and Impetratory]* and yet never deni'd it to be perform'd in Remembrance of Christ crucified. But here our Author has grossly injur'd Mr. *Thorndike*. For,

1. Mr. *Thorndike* owns no such thing (as I can find) that the Elements are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. But he speaks things plainly inconsistent with it, as he saith, N. 1. *The Sacra-*

ment containing Mystically, Spiritually and Sacramentally (that is, as in and by a Sacrament) tendreth and exhibiteth, not the Body of Christ, much less turn'd into it. Nay further he saith, *The Eucharist is Nothing else but the Representation here upon Earth of what is done in Heaven.* N. 4.

2. Neither doth he say, *the Elements are truly the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross*, but the Eucharist, and the Eucharist as Representing. For thus he saith, N. 10. Not the Elements, *but the breaking, pouring forth, distributing, dealing, are all parts of the Sacrifice, as the whole action is that Sacrifice by which the Covenant of Grace is confirmed.* N. 10. And further, *the Eucharist* [that is as thus administered] *is the same Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross.* How? *As that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it representeth?* That is, so far as the Representer of the thing may be said to be the thing Represented, so far is the *Eucharist the same Sacrifice.*

3. When he saith, *the Eucharist is Propitiatory and Impetratory*; he doth not in the least own that it is after the same manner that the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross was *Propitiatory and Impetratory.*

(1.) Because he saith, *Whether the Eucharist in regard of the Oblation, so in regard of the Consecration, may be call'd a Propitiatory Sacrifice,* is a Question among some of the Church of Rome. N. 6.

(2.) He refers it wholly to the Participation of it. *If men, saith he, did but consider, that the Eucharist had never been instituted but to be participated, they would find it impertinent to alledg any reason why it should be a Sacrifice, that tendeth not to the participation of it;* which is directed against the Doctrine of the Church of Rome. N. 10.

(3.) He most peculiarly makes the Propitiation and Impetration in the Sacrament to respect the Prayers of the Church there offer'd up. N. 11. For thus he concludes, *Is not the Sacrament a Propitiatory and Impetratory Sacrifice by vertue of the Consecration, though in order to the Oblation and Presentation of it by the Prayers of their Church?* So that the Case remains still where it was; if it be a Real Propitiatory Sacrifice; it's not Representative, for the one implies the Presence, the other the Absence of the same thing; the one implies it's the thing, the other implies it's only the sign or resemblance of it; and so a thing can be no more the Representative of it self, than it can be it self and not it self at the same time.

But he undertakes further, *that the other is not more difficult to be conceived, viz. How Christ's Body may be Really present in this Sa-*



## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

crament, and yet his Body not really Broken there, nor his Blood actually spilt. Here the *Apologist* took up the Cause after this manner :  
 “ Something is really broken and actually spilt, if it be a Real  
 “ and Propitiatory Sacrifice ; something is really broken and  
 “ actually spilt, as our senses tell us, and as they acknowledg :  
 “ And now that the Body and Blood should only be there, and  
 “ yet that not be the Body that is broken, nor that be the  
 “ Blood that is spilt, is next to the affirming, that it’s broken,  
 “ and not broken, spilt and not spilt. But our Author here  
 unties the knot, as he presumes ; For, saith he, all this may yet  
 be, that *his Body may be there, and his Body not be broken, &c.* Since  
 ’tis not present there Corporeally, but Sacramentally only ; which manner  
 of presence is no more consistent with real Breaking or Spilling, than are  
*Spirits, or the Glorified Bodies of the Blessed, which though Real and Substantial Bodies still, are notwithstanding not at all susceptible of those Corporeal Accidents.*

In answer to this, let us consider,

What is that Body of Christ which is said to be *Really present in the Sacrament.* And that is the same Body which our Saviour lived in, and that hung upon the Cross, and which the Elements are turn’d into by Consecration. But will he say the Question is not concerning the nature of the Body, which is granted to be a proper Body consisting of Flesh and Blood ; but the presence of that Body, which is not Corporeal but Sacramental only, which manner of presence is no more consistent with real Breaking, &c. than the *Glorified Bodies of the Blessed, which though Real and Substantial Bodies, are not susceptible of those Corporeal Accidents.*

But to this I answer,

1. That the Body we speak of, is not a Glorified Body, but the same Body which hung upon the Cross, which consisted of Flesh and Blood, and had Flesh that might be broken, and Blood that might be spilt.

2. As to the *Sacramental Presence of a Substantial Body* consisting of Flesh and Blood, Bones and Sinews (which they grant the Body in the Sacrament to have) whatever our Author thinks, is surely one of the most difficult things to be conceived in the world. For it is to suppose a thing to be without being that thing which it is ; to suppose a Body to be there, and yet to be divested of all the Properties belonging to that Body. Nay it’s to suppose that which is a Real and Substantial Body to be only representatively present,



present, and by way of Signification; which is as much as to say, the Body is not present, for the same thing cannot be the thing, and the Representation of the thing.

3. There is no more reason for this *Sacramental Presence* of a Real Body, than there is for its being a Sacramental and not a Substantial Body: For what is the reason why they ascribe a *Sacramental Presence* to a Real Body, but because they know there are none of the Tokens belonging to such a Presence; and then why should it not be a Real Body, but Sacramental, when there are none of the Properties belonging to a Real Body to be discerned, or existent in it?

4. To this I add; therefore there can be no such thing as what he calls a *Sacramental Breaking and Spilling* of Real Body and Blood. For such as the Body is, such is the Presence, such the Breaking and Spilling; and why he should argue from a Sacramental Presence to a Sacramental Breaking and Spilling, and not argue from a Substantial existence of a Body to Real Presence and Real Spilling, is a thing may *not be difficult* to our Author, but is surely in reason not to be conceiv'd. If the *Absurdities* be *gross*, let them thank themselves for it, for they are no other than they first offer to the world, and it's no wonder the world returns them upon them with advantage.

#### Seventh Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*Popery puts out the Understanding of those of her own Communion, Char. 7. and tears out the Hearts of all others: whom she cannot deceive, she will destroy. The Absurdity of Auricular Confession is endless, where a man unloads himself of all his sins, by whispering them into the Priests ears. Likewise Transubstantiation, where men must renounce all their Five Senses. The Pope's Infallibility keeps a good decorum with the rest. He alone cannot err, and all others, without some of his assistance, cannot but err.*

Upon this our Author saith, their Religion is attacked only by the *Unchristian Artifices of passion and imposture*. But why only? For supposing Popery puts not out the understanding of others; or that in *Transubstantiation* men don't renounce all their five senses, &c. yet is there no Implicit Faith, no *Transubstantiation*, no other Principles owned by their Church, that the Protestants do attack?

He saith further, that in this Character there are as many *Calumnies as Lines*. And that remains to be tried according to the Particulars he breaks it into. As,

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

1. It asserts that Popery puts out the Understanding of those of her own Communion. This Assertion was not introduced here either by the *Adviser* in his *Assertions*, or by the *Apologist*. But it was particularly handled in the *Apology*, Assert. 14. p. 29. and Assert. 25. p. 48. where it's proved, (1.) That in their Church, to believe the Church, without a reason, is not only *safe*, but *meritorious* ; and that whoever thus implicitly believes, is a *good Catholic*. (2.) That *Ignorance* is in their Opinion the Mother of *Devotion*. (3.) That it's a mortal sin so much as to doubt , and so no room is left for enquiry. (4.) That they take away the Key of all Spiritual and Divine knowledg, the Holy Scriptures. Now instead of an Answer, our Author has in his *Sayings* wholly left out Assert. 14. and blows off all that is said in Assert. 15. with this one word, *it's a great Calumny*, p. 51. And what he now offers upon this Head, is, (1.) that *they have many Books, Catechisms, &c.* I wish he could say the Scriptures, *to be ignorant of which is to be ignorant of Christ, saith their Canon Law*, Dist. 38. *Si juxta* ; but That the people are not allowed so much as a *Summary* of. And the time was in the Reign of *Implicit Faith*, and before Heresie disturb'd the peace of its Empire, that persons have been burnt for teaching their Children the Creed and the Lord's-Prayer in the Vulgar Tongue. (2.) He saith, *There's none but knows, that whoever will be a Christian must submit his Understanding to such Mysteries that are above it.* Therefore will it follow, he must not so much as enquire what those Mysteries are, and whether they are of that kind, as he must *submit his Understanding to* ; whether, that is, they are of the Doctrines of our Saviour, or of men ?

2. Popery tears out the Hearts of all others out of her Communion ; whom she cannot deceive, she will destroy. This, saith our Author, is false. How so ? (1.) because though Catholics are bound to go and teach all Nations, yet when men are so obstinate as to reject all Instructions, they are taught to go elsewhere, and only to pity and pray for such blind souls, but not to destroy them. Witness the course they took in the *West-Indies* in the Conversion of the poor Natives, a course that made them abhor Christianity, as *Bartholomæus Casas*, a Bishop of theirs present, relates, to whom I refer our Author.

(2.) He answers, *'Tis true, in the Catholick Church care is taken to preserve all such as are her Members, firm in her Communion, and there*

there are not wanting Threats to keep the inconstant from being misled into Error ; as likewise punishments to reduce such as leave her, and blindly run after false Guides. A fair Concession ! And which will lead us into an examination of the case, and teach the world what they are to expect. For if all within her Communion are expos'd to their Threats and Punishments , we know how large a share of the world, according to their computation, is to be taken in, since they claim a Jurisdiction over all Christians and Churches. But,

(3.) He saith, *If for this reason [such Punishments] she must be said to tear out their Hearts, and destroy such as she cannot deceive; what is to be the Character of this Preacher's Church, which by the consent of Bishops is fenced with such Laws as punishes with loss of Goods, Imprisonment and Death, not only those who leave her Communion, but likewise those who were never members of it ? But we are not concern'd for the present so much to understand what the Preacher's Church is, as that Church which the Preacher is not of. Was there never no Tearing or Destroying elsewhere ? Yes surely, somewhat looks that way ; I cannot say, saith our Author, but that rash Zeal, headlong Revenge, or detestable Avarice, may have hurried some of ours upon such barbarous attempts. But certainly never did any Christians deliberately and with counsel thus deeply engage themselves in Blood. So that if he is to be credited, if there have been Barbarous Attempts, it was only rash zeal, &c. but not deliberate, not with Counsel and Law. And it has been only some that have been thus hurried to such attempts, but not a considerable Body among them; and much less such as have had the Supreme Regiment in their Church. As for the Laws the Preacher's Church is fenced with, our Author surely knows from what occasion they arose, and whose practices they were that gave birth to them; and he ought to know again, that the Laws in their Execution never produced such Barbarous Attempts, as what he calls their own rash Zeal, Headlong Revenge, and Detestable Avarice. So that if Law and no Law be compared, the state of no Law (if such it was) has been far more mischievous than that of Law. But were there never any Christians that did thus deliberately and with counsel engage themselves in Blood, as, he saith, the Preacher's Church has done ? What thinks he of the Church of Rome ? are they not Christians ? And were there never any such things deliberately and with Counsel perpetrated amongst them ? Have they no Councils,*

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

cils, no Laws that touch upon this point? And were there never any *Christians engaged in Blood* upon pursuance of those Laws? Is there no such thing as Excommunicating and Anathematizing Hereticks among them? No delivering over persons so convicted and condemned, to the Secular Power? And is there no such thing as compelling such Secular Powers to exterminate those Hereticks out of their Dominions? Is there no *Confiscations of Goods, Imprisonment, no Death* for such as are obstinate? And were there never Persons, Families, Countries that suffer'd under Crusado's issued out against them, in obedience to such Laws, Canons and Decrees? Surely our Author is much to seek in the state of his present Church, if he is ignorant of this, and a thousand times more than I shall now tell him; and is very ignorant in the state of the Preacher's Church he has left, if he thinks his New Mother falls short of *the* old, as he saith. But if he saith one thing and thinks another, how fit he may be to be a Member of the Church he is now in, I know not; but surely he could be no fit Member then of the Church he left. For a Conclusion of this, I shall crave our Author's patience to turn to the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent the Third, Can. 3.* and he will see I have not said this without Book, or wrong'd his Church, however he may have wrong'd the Preacher's Church in his account of it.

3. *The Absurdity of Auricular Confession is endless, where a man unloads himself of all his sins, by whispering them into the Priests Ears.* Of this, he saith, *it's a Calumny and Misrepresentation; since no Catholics teach that Only whispering sins in the Ears of a Priest is sufficient for their Remission.* Nor doth the Preacher say that only whispering is sufficient, for he must needs know that there is the making up their Crofs, and saying *Mea Culpa*, and many other things to be done. Where then is the *Calumny and Misrepresentation*? Is it in the *Unloading*? But why is not that as fit as *expiating*, which is the phrase used by their own Catechism, where they are taught that *the Faithful ought to be in nothing more solicitous than to take care to expiate their Soul by Confession*? Is it because it's called *whispering*? For what then serve their Boxes, and why is it call'd a Seal? Is it because of the easiness of it? That is the case at the last. For, saith he, *every one will see how insincere this Preacher was in saying, that a man unloads himself, &c. To make his Followers believe the Papists to be so sottish as to think their sins forgiven by a whisper only*? He may e'ne turn his anger upon his own

†

Church

Church for teaching this Doctrine, for from thence the Preacher learn'd it, which faith, The Sacrament of Confession was graciously instituted on purpose to supply the place of Contrition. For *Ibid. Sect. 46.* further proof of this, I remit the Reader to the Apology, *Affertion 21.*

4. *Of Transubstantiation, where men must renounce all their Five Senses at once.* Here the Apologist charged our Author with a small falsification, which indeed he has now mended, but not acknowledged. But he will make up that defect by the force of his Argument; for now he seriously undertakes to prove that in *Transubstantiation* they don't renounce all their Five Senses. As for three of them he has nothing to say; but then *Sight* and *Hearing* are so far from being against, that they eminently serve for the proof of it. As how! If, faith he, we follow our *Hearing*, which is the sense by which Faith comes, we are oblig'd to believe it. Christ's words expressly signify and declare the Sacrament is his Body. These words we hear deliver'd by those whom he has appointed to Teach and Instruct the Flock, to wit, the Pastors of the Church; these words we see likewise, and read in Holy Scripture. So that if we follow our Ears and our Eyes directed by the Word of God, we are bound to believe this Mystery, and consequently do not Renounce all our Five Senses at once. Well! but do we hear Christ thus declaring? No, but we hear the Church. Has the Church then such an Organical voice to speak, as we have Ears to hear? No, but the Church teaches by its Pastors. But are the Pastors we hear, all Infallible in their Teaching? And are we to believe them, although they teach contrary to sense and reason? There indeed he has lost the Case. But however he brings in *Sight* to his relief. For these words, faith he, we see likewise, and read in Holy Scripture.—And whilst we let both our Senses and Reason be immediately directed by God's Word, which is Infallible, we more reverence the Scriptures, and believe upon better Grounds than the Protestants. Thus we are at last led to a Private Spirit, and the Protestant way of resolving Faith into the Scriptures, without need of any Infallible Interpreter. For 'tis but letting our Senses and Reason be immediately directed by God's Word, which is Infallible, and we may soon be satisfied. I heartily thank our Author for this free Concession; for these are the Grounds Protestants do believe upon. But yet he will needs have it, that they believe upon better Grounds than the Protestants. This I am apt to think he will no more be able to prove, than that they Reverence the Scrip-



## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

tures more than Protestants. However this he attempts and gives this reason for, that Protestants let natural Objects, ever about Mysteries of their Faith, have the direction of their Senses, in which they are so often deceived, rather than the Word of God, which cannot deceive them. But where has the Word of God taught us that we are not to judg of Natural Objects by those Senses which he has given us to judg of Natural Objects by ? Will he undertake to prove this also ? When he himself acknowledges that to frame a judgment of the nature or substance of a thing, we must depend upon the information of sense, and that the common and natural way is to judg according to the relation the senses give, from the external and natural accidents of the thing. And now is not a Wafer a Sensible Object, and are we not to judg of it according to the Relation the Senses give of it, and from its external and natural accidents ? How will our Author salve this difficulty ? That he proceeds in after this manner : But if we desire to frame a true judgment [as if the other was a false one] of what is the Nature and Substance of such an Object, not according to a Natural Being, but according to the Divine Power, and what it may have of Supernatural ; the Senses ought not to be laid aside, but we must consider here too the information these give, not now from the Natural Accidents, but from the Word of God. I should have thought the Conclusion to be infer'd from hence would rather be, the Senses ought to be laid aside, forasmuch as we are not in such case to judg of the Natural Accidents according to what they report. For I must confess he is one of the first I have met with that has improved the Argument this way, and that appeals to the Senses for the proof of Transubstantiation, which their Church so cautiously warns them against in this matter. But he will illustrate this by an instance in another matter. A Friend, saith he, sends me a transparent Stone, of which when I would make a judgment, I cannot do it without the information of my Senses. These may inform me two ways, either by looking upon the thing it self, or by reading the Letter, sent along with it, or the report of the Bearer. If I take the information of my Senses from the view of the Stone, I judg it to be a pebble ; if from the Letter (wrote by an excellent Artist) and the Bearer (a skilful Jeweller) I judg it to be a true Diamond, upon their authority and greater skill. Now in which judgment of these ought I to acquiesce ? Certainly in this last, and yet in so doing I hope I should not renounce all my Five Senses at once. — So since my Senses assure me from Scripture and the Pastors of God's Church, that the Sacrament is Christ's Body ; I am bound in reason to judg

judg of it so, rather than from the Natural Accidents, to judg it to be Bread: So that in thus believing this Mystery, we do not renounce, but follow our Senses.

But his Instance reaches not the Case:

1. Because the judging, whether a Transparent Stone be a Counterfeit or a Diamond, is not a matter of mere sense, but judgment, skill and experience, and belongs to an Artist. But Sense will teach every one whether it be a Stone or a Pea, hard, or soft, transparent, or opacous. But now the Case before us is, whether what we see is a bit of Bread, or the Body of a Man; whether it's broken or whole, &c. And therefore to put the case right, and make it parallel, he must suppose the Stone to be a known Diamond, as known to him it's sent to, as to him that sent it; and that the Letter and Bearer both affirm this small Stone which he now holds betwixt his fingers, and knows by his Senses to be a Stone and not a Man, is yet the great *Mogul* in person, and so is every Diamond besides that comes over, and yet that Prince is still in his own Country. Must that person now, because of their *Authority and greater skill*, think himself bound to *acquiesce* in their judgment against the testimony of sense; or must he not renounce his senses to do it?

2. He supposes further, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is as plainly contained in Scripture, as it is in the Letter that the *Transparent Stone* then sent is a Diamond. But that he knows we deny; and when he can find these or the like words, This Bread is turn'd into my Natural Body, or is upon Consecration my true Substantial Body, it will be time enough to prepare a further Answer for him. The Question being not, whether what God teaches is not to be believed; but whether he hath so taught. So that it still remains true what the Preacher charged upon him, that in believing *Transubstantiation*, a man must renounce his five Senses at once, even bearing it self, which will not only teach us to distinguish betwixt the Host's, and the Priest's falling into the water (though we are blindfold) but we must in their way renounce that Sense to believe it, when we hear all Mankind concurring in it, that the report of Sense is to be believed, and that in our Author's words, *To frame a judgment of the nature or substance of a thing, we must depend upon Sense.*

5. The Pope alone cannot err, and all others without some of his Assistance, cannot but err. Here are two Propositions: 1. The Pope

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

cannot err. This our Author now calls an *Opinion of some School-Divines*, whereas the *Apologist* shewed it to be the prevailing *Opinion* of their Church, whether in respect of number or authority. It's the most common opinion of almost all *Catholicks*, as *Bellarmin*. It's the *Catholick Truth*, and what all *Catholick Doctors* teach in these days, saith *Suarez*. But to this not a word. (2.) *All others cannot but err*. Here our Author is guilty of a new *Misrepresentation*. It is charged upon us, saith he, *because we believe the members of our Church to be fallible, that therefore they cannot but err*. Where he changes the Proposition into a Conclusion, by foisting in the word, *Therefore*, and then running it down as a most *Illogical* and *absurd consequence*; but let him answer for the faults of it, whose consequence it is. The consequence then be to himself, and let the Proposition be the Preacher's, that *all others without some of his assistance cannot but err*. This is absolutely false, saith our Author, and so say I too; but it is true Popery.

Catech. Trid.  
Art. Symb. 9.  
Sect. 19. Edit.  
Lugd. 1676.

Let their Catechism decide the Case, to that I appeal, which thus delivers the sense of their Church upon it, *But as this one Church* (which the Pope of Rome is at the Head of, *Sect. 15.*) *cannot err in delivering the Doctrine of Faith and Manners, seeing it's governed by the Holy Ghost: So all the rest, which assume to themselves the name of a Church, must of necessity be engaged in the most pernicious Errors of Doctrine and Manners, as being led by the spirit of the Devil*. Now here is the whole *Calumny* at large. If men submit to the Pope, and are in his Church, they have the benefit and assistance of his *Infallibility*, and are under the Guidance of it as secure as in the Ark of Noah; but if they leave it, they are drown'd in error and perdition. And surely, while they are in actual Error, they cannot but err, according to the known Axiom, *Quicquid est quamdiu est, necesse est esse*. Because the *Apologist* before was modest, and having not seen the Sermon it self, and so not fully understanding the sense of it) would neither too hastily condemn or acquit, but after he had said what he thought fit upon it, concludes, *If the Preacher went beyond this, what Author or Authors he had for it, I know not, they do not at present occur to me*; our Author begins to exult, saying, *It's such a Consequence as the Apologizer himself knows not how to justify, (nor need not as a Consequence, for that's his own) and yet he has not goodness enough to acquit us from so foul a Calumny*. The matter it seems is foul, and is prov'd upon them, let him now shew his goodness in confessing the Charge, or more of his strength to prove it a *Calumny*.

Eighth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

He is professedly edified in ignorance by his Church, Praying and Pro- Char. 3.  
phesying in an Unknown Tongue. They make no other use or account of  
Confession, than what profest Drunkards do of Vomiting.

The first shall be considered in another place, Char. 14. As to  
the second, The *Apologist* shew'd what is the sense of the word  
Prophecy in the 1 Cor. 14. which the Preacher there refer'd to,  
viz. that the Apostle there understands by it the expounding the  
Articles of the Christian Faith, and of the Scriptures that contain it.  
But here our Author grievously mistakes him when he adds, and  
to be the same as Preaching. For that he affirmed not, as well know-  
ing that the Apostle is to be otherwise understood than of Vul-  
gar Preaching. (1.) Because the Apostle there distinguishes it  
from Doctrine, v. 6. (2.) Because of the way it was exercised  
in, when one spoke after another; agreeably to the custom of  
the Jewish Doctors in their Synagogues, of whom *Philo* saith,  
that one read the Bible, and another of the more skilful *ἱερα μὲν νομῶν* Lib. *Omnem*  
*παρίδον*, passing through places not understood, expounded them. (3.) *probum esse*  
Because it was an extraordinary gift by Revelation, v. 29, 30, 31, *liberum.*  
32. and reckoned as such amongst them, c. 12. 10. — 13. 2. 9.

2. The *Apologist* shew'd farther, it was not reasonable to fix  
this sense upon the Preacher, because he must needs know it to  
be otherwise. To this our Author briskly returns, Marry, if they  
never Preached contrary to what they knew, this would be a good Rule.  
And he has found it by woful experience to be a hard task to  
discover it; though it has been plainly made out that some write  
contrary to what they know.

3. He shew'd farther, that the Preacher was speaking about  
Worship, and so consequently it must be what is so accounted;  
and therefore that this must be rather the Reading of Lessons out  
of Scripture and Hymns (which are sometimes call'd Prophecy,  
1 Chron. 25. 1.) and which are in their Church-Service in an  
Unknown Tongue. This our Author passes by, as also the Chal-  
lenge following it.

But yet he will have it a Calumny, whilst he asserts a thing of  
the Papists, which in the common acceptation of the word is absolutely  
false. But what if it was the common acceptation of the word, if not  
the acceptation the Apostle takes it in, in that place which the  
Preacher

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Preacher refers to? But what if it be not the common acceptance of the word, but that it's taken vulgarly for foretelling things to come? Who then is the Calumniator?

Pulpit-Sayings, p. 5, 6.

2. *They make no other use of Confession, than what profligate Drunkards do of Vomiting.* Our Author saith, *This is a most putrid Calumny, and that the Vindicator dares not defend, but only that so it is in the practice of many of their Church.* This he complains of, and with good reason; but then what shall be said of one that after he has told a story of one that declaim'd against the Papists, for a *Generation of Vipers, and a profligate sort of men, knowing but two Families, and those good men*; from thence takes occasion to exclaim, *But this is to the Protestant-tune: if a man can't tell how to run down Popery, though he knows nothing of it, he's no true Son of the Church of England.* This is *Cafe for Cafe*.

But was this all the *Apologist* had to say in defence of the Preacher? did not he produce Authorities of their own as to the General practice? Did he not refer to their *Doctrines* and Penances, and the *Taxa Camera Apostolice* in confirmation of it? This had more become him to have answered, than to put a *Cafe*.

### Ninth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

Char. 9.

It consists of three Paragraphs: 1. *He pays his Devotions to Saints Canonized for Money and Treason.* Here the *Apologist* charges the *Sayer* with an alteration of the Preacher's words, from which he would bring himself off by saying it's *an insinuation, which to the Hearers is as good as an Assertion*; whereas the corruption was, that he turn'd a Particular into an Universal.

Here our Author observes against the *Apologist*,

Somners Antiq. of Canturb. p. 248.

1. *That he proves first it may so happen, which is as much to the purpose, as for one to say the Church-of-England-men are corrupters of God's Word, because 'tis possible they may be so.* But the *case* is far otherwise; for if there be no certainty, but that the Pope may Canonize a Rebel for a Saint, then there is no certainty but that the Saint may be no Saint. And then what become of the Devotions of the Supplicants, as those to *Thomas à Becket*, at whose Shrines were more Offerings made, than to Christ himself?

(2.) *He saith it has been done, and in the next line comes in with an instance, where it had like to have been done.* The instance was of *Maria*



*Maria Visitationis*, where indeed it was not done; but that it was not, was more from the King of Spain's Jealousie, than the Pope's Sagaciousness, who sanctified her by Letters under his own hand. Our Author, I perceive, dares not so much as name this Instance.

(3.) As for the Instance of *Thomas à Becket*, he saith he was Canoniz'd not for Rebellion, and because he adhered to the Pope against his Prince, but for his *Virtuous Life and Martyrdom*, and the attestation of his Sanctity by undeniable Miracles. Not for Rebellion! as if that would be express in the Reasons for his Canonization! I have read it was a Moot question, Whether he was damn'd for Treason, or Glorified as a Martyr. I think it not worth the while to decide it, but leave our Chronicles and our Author to struggle about it. But it minds me of a story told by *Bellarmin*, of one that was worshipped for a Martyr, and yet appear'd afterward and told them, he was damn'd.

Caesar. Hist.  
Memor. 18.  
c. 69.

De Purgat.  
l. 1. c.

2. They pray to a Crucifix of Wood or Stone, as well as to Christ himself, and attribute as much satisfaction to it, as to the Blood of Christ. Our Author rejoyns, that This is every word an Infamous Falshood. And continues, Though the Vindicator appeals to the Words and Forms of some of our Prayers, and then says, That [if words will make it plain, the Preacher was not mistaken] yet this is so childish a plea, that methinks it ought to be beneath a Divine, especially a man of conscience, to charge so gross an abomination upon such a frothy pretext. And then he gives his reason. I must confess that if the Vindicator had only the Words and Forms of their Prayers to plead in Vindication of the Preacher, without attending to the sense and reason of the thing, that it might be as childish and frothy as he represents it; and he would have *Deut. 32. 1.* and the *Benedicite* used in our Church against him, as our Author argues. But if he had read on, he would have found that it was the words as necessarily including such a sense, and that the Apologist did covertly refer him to the Papist Represented and not Misrepresented. Our Author now confesses himself to be the same that wrote the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*; and should be therefore concern'd to have defended it against the forecited Answer. In which was shewn:

1. That the Cross in the Church of Rome as it's Representative, *Pap. Repres.* fo is Consecrated by an Office on purpose composed for it. 2. That *and not Mis-* at the Consecration of it they pray that the Lord would bless the *repres. Ch. 1.* Wood of the Cross that it may be a saving remedy to Mankind, a stability

of Faith, an increase of good Works, and the Redemption of Souls; and that Christ would take this Cross into his hands; and that all that offer it, may by the merit of this Cross be delivered from every Sin they have committed. 3. That it's esteem'd upon Consecration to have those Virtues communicated to it. 4. That they adore it even with *Latria*, the Worship they give to God, and direct their Prayers to it. 5. That those Prayers are without a Figure, and in a proper Sense applied to the Material Cross. This the Author of that Book proved (1.) as that throughout, the Cross is distinguished from Christ, because they pray to Christ to bless the Cross, and that he would communicate such Virtues to it. (2.) From their own Authors, such as *Soto*, *Catharinus* and *Aquinas*. (3.) From the severe Censures of those who held otherwise, as was the case of *Johannes Ægidius Canon of Sevil*, and *Imbert of Bourdeaux*, and the Curate of *Pomyrol*. Our Author talks of a *Forehead*, of those that make up against them; it's a Word I am not us'd to, but he must have somewhat like it, that allows this Practice to be worse than *Heathenish*, and a gross *Abomination*; and yet lets all this to this day lye unanswer'd, and thinks to put us off with the same crude Replies that stand there confuted. In Conclusion, it appears to be no more true, that they are *defamed* by the method used in the Church of England, than that the Church of Rome is the *Mother-Church* of the Church of England (as our Author suggests.)

3. Making a particular Confession of our Sins to Men, instead of keeping up wholesome Discipline, is the way to corrupt it, and tends to the debauching both Laity and Clergy. Here our Author spends what he has to say, both against Preacher and Vindicator, in shewing special Confession to be allow'd in the Church of England, and in exclaiming against his Adversaries for falling foul upon what he calls the best of Institutions: As if either of them were against that which their own Church encourages, and which the Preacher himself calls a *wholesome Discipline*. But the beginning of the Paragraph shews what Confession the Preacher thus Censures, viz. *Auricular Confession*, as it is practised in the Church of Rome at this day; that Confession, which the Apologist elsewhere describes from themselves, that requires beforehand a diligent Examination of the Conscience about all and singular mortal Sins, even the most Secret, with all their Circumstances, so far as may change the nature of the Sin, and then to discover all those they can

Chap. 2. p. 7,

10. 11.

Chap. 3. p. 7, 9.

Chap. 2. p. 12.

Chap. 2. p. 8,

12. and Chap.

3. p. 8.

can call to mind to the Priest, from whom they expect Absolution, and without which Absolution is not to be expected; nor can they have any benefit of the Absolution. It's of this the Preacher saith, That the *Consequence of it*, is to run an apparent hazard of being undone in many Cases by Knaves for Interest, or by Fools out of Levity and Inconstancy, and a blabbing Humor, that lets them into the Secrets of Families, &c. Besides, instead of keeping up a wholesome Discipline, it's the way to corrupt it, and tends to the debauching both Laity and Clergy, in as many ways as there are Sins to be committed, when the Confessor and the Penitent begin to discover and understand one another. And this the Apologist confirmed from the Complaints made by good Men of their own Communion, from the shameful Cases to be found in their Casuists, from the Bulls of Popes, *Contra solicitantes in Confessione*. And of which I find a late Instance.

Histoire de l'  
Inquisition de  
Goa, Chap. 4.

Tenth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

*The Churches Interest is the Center of their Religion, and their Con-* Char. 10.  
*sciences turn upon the same Pin. Every thing is Pious, Conscientious and Meritorious, that makes for their Cause.* What is said, as to the first of these, by the Apologist, That the Churches Interest is the Center of their Religion: Our Author has not thought fit to recite, and much less to confute. As to the latter, the Apologist produced a Constitution of the Jesuits; but this the Sayer saith, is a wrested Interpretation, contrary to its plain meaning. But, why then did not our Author venture to assign this plain meaning of it; and to shew the meaning the Apologist thought belong'd to it, to be thus wrested? Who without doubt would have thought one good Argument of much better Authority, than a hundred bare Affirmations, tho never so positive. But he has two things yet in reserve.

1. That after all, the Apologist can say, He cannot but own it to be a received Maxim among all, even the loosest of our Divines and Casuists, That [no Evil is to be done, that God may come of it.] To speak ingenuously, I do not find him so forward to own it; but if he did (as we cannot think they will interminis run so counter to the Apostle) yet the Question is, what is Evil and Good? and whether that is not Good, which makes for their Cause? or whether the making for the Cause, makes not that which was

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ; -

*Evil to be Good.* And if so, our Author doth but beg the Question.

2. He appeals to his *Catholicks of this Nation, who quitted all rather than do an ill thing, take Oaths, Tests, or go to Church against their Conscience.* The main part of this lies in the last words, *against their Conscience*, for else that many of them did *take Oaths, go to Church, receive the Sacrament*, is, I suppose, out of Question.

### Eleventh Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

Char. II.

This he breaks into four parts.

1. *He changes Scripture into Legends.* Hereby the *Apologist* shew'd was understood either that the Legends are of as good Authority in the Church of Rome as Scripture ; or that in their publick Offices, they used Legends, where they should have used the Scripture. He shews there is too much occasion given for the former amongst them, as when they own in their publick Offices, that *St. Bridget's Revelations came immediately from God to Her.* But here our Author interposes, and saith, *How does the Papist change the Scripture into Legends, when he's commanded by his Church to own the Scripture, as the Word of God ?* But if he owns the Scripture as the Word of God, because it's commanded by his Church ; then, wherein is the difference, if he be commanded by his Church to believe a Legend to be of Divine Revelation ? Our Author would have done a kind part if he had set us right in this matter between Divine Revelation and Divine Revelation, between the Revelation for Scripture, and the Divine Revelation for the Legends. But he saith, for all this, a Person is not alike obliged to assent. No! altho the Church requires it ? But that, saith he, the Church doth not ; for *tho he may read Legends if he pleases, yet he is not bound by his Church or Religion to give assent to, or believe any one passage in any one Legend whatsoever.* If he has no better Authority for the latter Branch, than the former, for he is not bound to assent ; than, for he may read them if he pleases ; his Cause is incapable of his support. For, how can he be at Liberty, whether he will read [hear] them if he pleases, when they are inserted into the Body of their Church-Service ; and are Lessons chosen out for their Instruction ? And he can as little say, they are not obliged to Assent to them, when the Church it self saith in its publick Office, *They come immediately from God.* Is it at last all come to this, that when things are instituted by Inspira-  
tion

tion of the Holy Ghost, as the Orders of St. Beneditt, and were received from the Holy Ghost, as the Rules of those Orders; and that the Popes were moved by the Holy Ghost, as in ordaining some Festivals, and declar'd others to be divinely inspired, as St. Brigit, and St. Catherine; and to come immediately from God, as their Offices; Is it all, I say, come to this; that he is not bound to give assent to, or believe any one Passage in any Legend whatsoever? Nor so much, as to believe any one to be a Saint, their Church has Canonized; no, not St. Brigit, St. Catherine, nor even the Great Xaverius. For tho some pretended Reformers (as he calls them) have been so easy and forward (it seems) as to have judged those things worthy of Credit, which he was Canonized for; yet no Member of the Church of Rome is bound to assent or believe, but he may believe, as well as read the Legends of them, if he pleases; and if he pleases he may forbear and suspend. And this our Author doth abundantly confirm, by approving what the Apologist produced out of Bellarmin and Canus, That all things contained in the Lives of the Saints, tho mentioned even in the Canonization, depend upon human Testimony, as to matters of Fact, and consequently are subject to Error. This, saith he, proves they are not bound to believe: I grant it as far as that goes; but then they are not bound to believe what their Church Representative doth declare to be of Divine Revelation, and to come immediately from God. Let him take which he pleases, if that will content him. But if in the mean time, their Church contradicts her self, and owns that at one time to be Divine Revelation, which at another time has only human Testimony, is the Apologist bound to reconcile her to her self? Surely that is an Office becoming our Author himself. And till he has done it, he must excuse us if we a little doubt of the certainty of Faith so much magnified in their Church. Here our Author concludes this matter; but the Apologist went on to the latter Branch, that in their publick Offices they often use Legends instead of Scripture, and have put out Scripture to bring in Legends. This he proves from the design of Cardinal Quignonius, who in the Reformation of the Breviary, put Scripture instead of Legends; but that was condemn'd, and the Office so far brought back to its former state. This was so full a proof of what the Preacher suggested, that our Author thought it best to let it drop. But if he will see the Character of the design, against he writes again, let him per-

Apology, p.

13, 14.

Sayings, p 21.



use the Cardinal's Preface, or consult *Espenceus*, in *Tom. 1. Digress. l. 1. c. n. p. 156.* which thus concludes of the former *Breviary*, *That many of the Histories of the Saints were so ill chose, that sometimes they begat Contempt and Laughter at the reading of them.*

P. 21, 22.

*L. Vives ad  
Calcem Libri  
de Corruptis  
Artibus.  
Espenceus ut  
supra.*

Lib. 5.

*Sayings, p. 21,  
22.*

This puts me in mind of a debt I am in to our Author at his fourth Character, who there tells us, that *he cannot but admire some Protestant Preachers, Writers, and otherwise sober Lay-men of late, who take upon them to ridicule, and slightly to wonder at the Papiſts for this their fond credulity, forsooth, in relation to old Legends, and Modern Lives of the Saints.* — This I admir'd at in him, because I find some *Popish Preachers, Writers, and otherwise sober Lay-men*, that are as hard to believe as the Protestants, and think as meanly of them. Attend we to *Ludovicus Vives* (a man, as I have heard, (saith *Espenceus* when he quotes him) out of all suspicion of an irreligious mind) who saith, *In writing the Lives of the Saints, every one writ as he was affected; so that his Inclination, not Truth, did draw out the History. How unworthy of the Saints, and Men, is the History of the Saints which they call the Golden Legend, since it's writ by a man of an Iron Mouth, and a Leaden Heart?* And again, *There have been men who esteemed it for a great piety to devise little Lies for Religion.* But here this good man needs a little correction; for if a good end be in prospect, inventions of men (*how incredible soever*) may in our Author's opinion be allowed (as he suggests). For, saith he, *there is scarce any thing in all those Books objected upon this score against the Papiſts, whether Ancient or Modern Legends, but however incredible it may appear, yet generally is all in order to a good end, and the working Christian effects in the Reader.* Here is now a Gate of *Mindus* sufficient to let in the whole Shoal of not only the *Mendaciola* of *Vives*, but all the Heroical Fictions of Ecclesiastical *Quixotism*, and to make them to become Authentick. But because our Author is so grave upon this Argument, that I doubt he may be in earnest, let me for once recommend to him some few instances, for an Exercise of his Talent this way, to shew how they serve a good End, and raise the Admiration of God's Power, Goodness and Mercy. Doubtless he will quit himself exceeding well, if he can inform us where the great spiritual Advantage is in the Relations of *St. Aldern's* and *Deicola's* hanging their Garments upon the Sun-beams; of *St. Kentigern's* setting a *Robin Red-breast's* Head to its Body; of *St. Odoaceus's* turning a Pound of Butter in-

to

to a Bell; of St. Mochus's hindring by Prayer the poor Lambs from Sucking their Dams. I might run into a Volume upon this Theme, if it were worth the while: But I suppose these may serve for the present to entertain his thoughts, and to shew the Reader how impertinent his Vindication of their Legends is. These are of the number of those which *Quignonius* saith, are the Subject of Scorn and Contempt; but here are others which are so inconsistent with true Religion, that their *Driedo* concludes they were devised by Hereticks, as when the Saints are said in the Agony of Death, to have warned or requir'd, that when translated out of this World, they should be worshipp'd, and be invoked in Afflictions and Dangers. It being not likely that these holy Men while in this World, should be solicitous of these Honours, who should rather pray with David, Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, O Lord.

De dogmatibus & libris Apocryphis, l. 4. c. 1. & Espencæus ut Supra.

2. He changes Sacraments into Shows, Priests into Puppets. Of this the *Apologist* produced his Instances, as 1. When they shew the Cup to the Laity, but suffer them not to partake of it. 2. When in their Solitary Masses, the Priest alone Communicates, and the People are only Spectators of the Solemnity, a Practice that the Council of Trent approves of, and commends. 3. When the Host is elevated at Mass for Adoration. 4. When it's carried about in publick Processions. In which cases the Sacrament is only shew'd to the People, and is contrary to the end for which it was instituted. For as it was to be in Remembrance of Christ, so it was to be partook of, and by partaking of which, we do shew forth his Death, 1 Cor. 11. 26. But to shew the Sacrament, and not to partake of it, is to change the Sacrament into a shew. To this our Author replies, Might not a Jew here step in, and with this Argument pretend, that Christ crucified was another shew upon Calvary? but all this is nothing but a method to teach Atheists, how to make the greatest Mysteries of Christianity ridiculous. As if Christianity in its first Institution was a ridiculous thing; and he that will bring it back to its first State, and have the Sacrament only so Administred, and used only to those ends for which it was ordain'd, must expose the Mysteries of it to the Scorn of Atheists. Cannot Christianity subtilise, or the Myteries of it be sacred, without we depart from the Simplicity and Purity of it, and set up new Institutions, or give new Ends to those Institutions? And because we are for partaking of it, and not making it an empty shew; because we

are

are for the People's partaking of it, as well as the Priest; and for their partaking of it in both Kinds, and not in one, according to the Primitive Institution; Must we teach *Atheists a method, how to make the Mysteries of Christianity ridiculous?* And because we declare against their Elevations, and exposing the Sacrament in their publick Processions, and their Adoration of it; may, by the same reason, *A Jew step in, and with this Argument pretend that Christ crucified was another shew upon Calvary?* But may not the Jew and the Atheist both step in, and deride the *Mysteries of Christianity*, when they are thus dress'd up for the Stage, and are turn'd into empty *Shows*? When they pretend to shew our Saviour as upon Mount *Calvary*, and that concludes in showing the Host; and when the Sacrament is call'd a Communion, and it concludes in the Elevation, Procession, or Sacerdotal Participation only? I am loth to return him his own words, *Those who make a shew of this, are within one step of the unbelieving Jews.* It had certainly better become our Author to have vindicated the Practice of his Church, in the Charge exhibited against them, and proved it *absolutely false*; or tho it was true, that they do not change the Sacrament into a *shew*, by advancing other ends than it was instituted for, and neglecting those that were proper to it.

3. He preaches Purgatory instead of Repentance. Our Author here replies, *'Tis absolutely false, inasmuch as in the plain import of the Words, it imprints this Notion in the Hearers, viz. That the Papists don't preach Repentance to the People, but instead of this they preach Purgatory.* But our Author may remember, that when it was said upon occasion, that [if Words will make it plain, the Preacher was not mistaken] it was put by with this, that it was a *Childish Plea*. And why should not this Priviledg be allowed of retorting in the same way? But how comes this to be more the plain import of the Words, than what immediately precedes? For would it not equally follow, that when the Preacher said [They change Scripture into Legends, Sacraments into Shows, Priests into Puppets], That the plain import of the Words is, they have no Scripture, but Legends; no Sacraments, but Shows; no Priests, but Puppets? But if there be no reason to take the Words in that Sense in the three former, there is none to take them so in the last. And therefore, the meaning of the Preacher is no other than that, whereas they should preach Repentance sincerely,

cerely, according as the Gospel teaches, they preach Purgatory, which invalidates it (as the *Apologist* shewed). This our Author saith, is a *mincing the Matter*; but however it's the true Representation of it. But if we so take it, it's yet, he saith, *False in it self*. Here I expected a smart Answer to the *Apologist*, who undertakes the Proof of what he asserted four ways.

1. As the Doctrine of Purgatory takes People off from one of the most powerful Arguments to Repentance, which is the fear of Hell. 2. It makes them more studious of what will set them safe, than what will make them happy. 3. It makes them defer their Repentance, because of a further Allowance of time in another state. 4. As they may be delivered thence by the Masses, Alms, and Prayers of the Living. Surely these are points of some Consequence, and if they are truly infer'd, do shrewdly shake the Foundations of a Purgatory: If false, it would have been some gratification to have the Proof of it attempted. But our Author is here silent; and falls to the proving it *false in it self*, so far as he himself has heard many Sermons of Repentance, and Purgatory never so much as mentioned, unless it were to shew the insufferable Torments of the place, and how great the hazard is, even of getting thither. But how doth this Answer the *Apologist's* Arguments to the contrary? He adds further, a Challenge to the *Apologizer*, to find out one Sermon of Spaniards, French, &c. in Latin, that sets out Purgatory to the People, as to make them neglect Repentance. But this is to beg the Question; for the Point in dispute is, whether the Doctrine of Purgatory doth not invalidate Repentance, and dispose People to neglect it. And then the preaching Purgatory, as it's set out in the Roman Church, is the preaching People into a neglect of Repentance.

4. He preaches *Faction* instead of Faith. If either the Preacher, or the *Apologist* thought it worth the while to write a Comment upon this, and to enlarge upon the subsequent Discourse in the Sermon, Volumes might be fill'd, beginning at the Apostolical Chair, (as it's call'd) and so descending to the parts belonging to that Communion; but the *Apologist* contented himself with a bare mentioning of the Pope's Jurisdiction over Princes, and the Power he challenges of deposing them. But here instead of relieving his Church, our Author carries the War amongst his Neighbours, always serving himself of a point, which he knows he may be safe in. However at length he appeals to their own

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Sermons, and fairly offers, *As for the Faction they can discover in our preaching, let them do their best, to find even half so much; we freely give them a thousand years to review, for to match these four of theirs.* And I will dare to return the Challenge, to find even half so much said for Obedience and Loyalty to Princes in all their Sermons for a Thousand years, as in the Sermons of those Four years preach'd amongst us. We find among them Sermons upon Sermons, about the Exaltation of the Pope's Power, and the Power of Holy Church over Princes; but as to Allegiance and Fealty to Princes, whether of their own or of another Religion, it's a difficult Theme, and rarely handled. But for that, saith he, *Let them take in likewise the Sermons that are now preached in our Chappels;* as if they would there preach up Faction, when it is to preach against themselves. But if we would know what their Zeal can do that way, let us look back to the blessed times of *Hildebrand*; nay, but step over Sea, and review the times of an Holy League; and there we may see it venting it self in a Torrent of Disloyalty against their Princes in the Sermons of *Poncet, Prevost, Baucher, &c.* and without doubt had it been for the Glory and Quiet of the Church to have had them published, we should have found some glorious things of this kind in the Sermons, even of *Bellarmin* himself, who we are told was employ'd as a Preacher in that busy time of the League. As for what he would fix upon the Sermons at present amongst us, if he could find any Disloyalty of that kind, he would not be put to the hard, but his common Shift of saying, *They make unworthy Reflections upon the Religion of their Prince, and insinuate Fears and Jealousies into the People.*

Maimburgs  
History of the  
Holy League,  
1. 1. p. 79. 1.  
2. p. 95. 1. 3.  
p. 428. 1. 4.  
p. 806.

### Twelfth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

Char. 12.

*There is a great noise of Alms made in his Church; but the Scope they too often vainly aim at, is the blessing of a presumed Saint; security from the external force of evil Spirits, by the Charms and Spells of Monkish Conjuratation, a sort of Ecclesiastical Magick. Nay, sometimes the Scope is that very wicked one of compounding with Heaven by their liberal Alms, for their unforfeaken Sins; and here in this Nation (whilst the Island was enchanted with Popery) there were granted Indulgences, even for what they call deadly Sins, for many thousand years to come.*

†

Here



Here our Author inveighs against the Doctor for writing in a strain becoming rather a *Play* than a *Sermon*; because he describes their Practices too much like what they are in themselves, and which he has rather fallen short of, than set forth according as they deserved. As for instance, What are their ways of Exorcising, but Conjurations sanctified, and bring that into the Church, which should be by an Anathema thrust out of it? Being such as a very valuable Person, could not reflect upon without the highest Indignation: and who after he had describ'd it from the *Ordo Baptizandi, cum modo visitandi*; the *Pastorals, Rituals, the Treasure and Manual of Exorcisms, Mengus's Flagellum Demonum, &c.* he thus concludes, *This is the manner of their Devotion for the use of their Exorcists, in which is such a heap of Folly, Madness, Superstition, Blasphemy, and ridiculous Guises, and playings with the Devil, that if any man amongst us should use such things, he would be in danger of being tried at the next Assizes for a Witch or Conjuror; however, certain it is, what ever the Devil loses by pretending to obey the Exorcist, he gains more by this horrible Debauchery of Christianity.* By this the Reader (he appeals to) may see whether the strain the Doctor wrote in, was not becoming the Subject. But why would not our Author leave the Reader to be judge, whether the Doctor had justly complain'd of him for his Omissions of what belong'd to the same Argument? Why did he not insert the *Motives* and the *Means*, as well as the *Ends*? Why was it omitted; that this Ecclesiastical Magick is what those wicked Spirits invent and in courage? Why did he not insert the *Avoidance of Anathemas*, a deliverance from the imaginary *Flames of Purgatory*; and their *Bessarion's Character of their Canonizations*? Why said he nothing of the *Alienation of Alms* hereby from their proper uses, the increase of *Superstition*, and the maintaining of an *Universal Usurper*? Why is there not a word of the Catalogue of the things hereby purchased, viz. *Shrines, Images, Lamps, Incense, Holy-water, Agnus Dei's, Blessed Grains, Roses, Pebles, Beads, Reliques, Pardons, &c.* all the goodly Inventory of *Superstition*? Was it out of favour to the Doctor, that this was not repeated? And doth he think the Doctor obliged, rather to give him thanks, than quarrel, for his not inserting this part of his *Discourse*? Or have we not Reason to think there was somewhat in it, which the Doctor suggests, that this was too Particular for the purpose of Men, who deal in *Generals*, which admit of less Discovery.

Bp. Taylor's  
*Diffusive*  
from Popery,  
Sect. 10.

Defence, p. 3.

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

thanks, we have reason to question; but the Publick have, because he gave an occasion for that good Defence; and for the publishing another Edition of that useful Sermon. But after all his pretended tenderness for the Doctor, he tells of another Champion that *draws him out to the full*; but what he hath done, I neither know, nor am concern'd; but if I may judg of his performance, by his Copartner we have to deal with, there is not much to be expected. But how exact and full soever that may be, yet our Author in abundance of Humility, resolves at last to *throw away a Page* upon the Doctor's twenty, in the *Examen of his Vindication*; which, he saith, he no sooner cast his Eye upon, but he *sees that now a Doctor, he understands no more their Doctrine and Practices, than when a Child he knew Gubbard from a Jesuit*: A very pretty Flourish, and a Comparison not amiss; for as in those days, it was no easy matter to *know a Gubbard from a Jesuit* (tho possibly one and the same) when Gubbard could be the Jesuit, and the Jesuit be Gubbard, as occasion served: So it is now in the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, which is so habit-ed and managed by men of Art, that like an Almanack that is calculated for the Meridian it's to serve, it's modell'd according to the Time, Place, Circumstances, and Service it's to respect. For in our Forefathers days it was true Popery, and spake as a Dragon; but in our days it comes forth with *Exposition* and *Representation*. If it's likely to be for the *Conversion of Hereticks*, then it shall have the Permission even of the Pope himself, to shew it self abroad in this new Attire; but if a private hand shall attempt it, he shall with *Imbert* be an *Heretick*, and be punished as such. If it be at Rome, and a Cardinal is to speak his own Sense, then *the Honour paid to an Image is Divine, and for the sake of the Image*. If it be for the Service of France, and a particular Cause, then the same Cardinal can subscribe to *Exposition*, and it's *not so much the honouring the Image, as the Apostle, or Martyr in the presence of the Image*. If it be to be suited to the humour of a great Marshal, then it's *not the Image, but Christ*, as the Bishop of Meaux words it; if it be for the Villagers, then it's *the Image and Christ*, as *Imbert's* Curate. So that it seems the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is one while a Gubbard, and another while a Jesuit, varying, with *Proteus*, its Forms, and taking with the Camelion its Colour and Complexion, from the Objects and Occasions it meets with. It's no wonder then, if

*Exposition of  
the Doctrine  
of the Church  
of England,  
Preface.*

if the Doctor, when a Doctor, can no more understand the Doctrine of their Church, than when a Child he could know Gubhard from a Jesuit. But however, here is Doctrine and Practice joyned together; and for once we will try whether the Doctor has not indeed understood both too well for our Author to thank him. But why doth not the Doctor understand their Doctrine or Practice? It's because he said,

1. Sometimes the Scope is, that very wicked one of compounding with Heaven by liberal Alms, for their unforsaken Sins. Our Author grants then, that if this be the Scope they direct their Alms to [to compound by them for their unforsaken Sins], it's a very wicked one. But this saith, He was without one word of proof; and now the Doctor in his Defence only proves at large the Practice of Indulgences, but not a word of their being given for unforsaken Sins. We own the Power of Indulgences, but that this can or may be done, either with Money, or without, for unforsaken Sins, this we look upon as Abominable and Absurd, in the sight both of God and Man.

But has the Doctor prov'd nothing but the Practice of Indulgences? Has he not also prov'd beyond Exception, that Gain is made of them? and that there was too great Reason for that Complaint in Matthew Paris, That Christ's Blood altho it be sufficient to save Souls, yet the same without Satisfaction applied by the Pope, is not sufficient, In Hen. 3. Romanorum loculos impregnare, to fill their Coffers at Rome? Hath not the Doctor further prov'd, that by this course, they compound with Heaven for their Sins? But will he say, What is this to the purpose? Yes, it is to him that saith, Indulgences are not for forgiveness of Sins. But he persists still, there is not a word of their being given for unforsaken Sins. Not a word! What is there then amongst all that List of Pardons (as he calls it)? There is not, he saith, that the Doctor can pretend, makes for this intent, excepting that of Boniface 9; which too has nothing in it for his purpose, besides his own false Translation, and the perverse Construction he puts upon it. The Author quoted for this by the Doctor, is Theodorick Niem, who saith, That Boniface the 9th, (who De Schismate was an Insatiable Gulph, and had none like to him in Covetousness) 1. 1. c. 68. p. not being content with the Offerings at the Jubilee, which by 73. the Death of Urban, he enter'd upon, altho they rose to a vast Sum, sent his Collectors with Indulgences to many Countrys, offering them thereby the same spiritual Advantages, which they should have reap'd by coming to Rome, upon the depositing

Sayings, p. 35.

so much Money, as would have born their charges thither; in which they prospered so well, that by the vending of them in one Province, they carried away above a hundred thousand Florins, *Quia omnia peccata sine Pœnitentia ipsis confitentibus relaxarunt*; because (as the Doctor translates it) he gave (by them) Indulgence for all Sins without Repentance. This, saith our Author, is a false Translation, and perverse Construction. But why so, doth not Pœnitentia signifie Repentance? Or is Penance truly any other than Repentance? If it be, then why do the Rhemists translate *μετάνοια*, by Penance, *Math. 3. 8, &c.*? But he saith, Pœnitentia here signifies Penance, and not Repentance, which is indispensably imply'd in their Confession, which cannot be rightly perform'd without Repentance. What he saith upon another occasion, may with a little Alteration be fitly return'd to him. Marry, if Confession was never performed among them, but when it was rightly perform'd, this would be a good Reason. But if Confession among them be perform'd without Repentance, (as shall afterward be shewn in *Char. 14.*) then this is no Reason. But besides, this is not to the purpose. For when he saith, That Pœnitentia here signifies Penance, and not Repentance, he is to fetch his Reason for it from the Author, whose Sense is in dispute, and to consider the Circumstances of the place that is quoted; but of this he has not one tittle; so that all that he saith, amounts to no more than this, that Pœnitentia here signifies Penance, and not Repentance; because it so signifies: Which makes me think that he never look'd into the Author; or if he had so done, he would have seen what Reason the Doctor had for his Translation. For

1. It's plain from the History, that the Business in hand was to utter the Pardons to the best Advantage; that in *Matthæw Paris's* Phrase, they might thereby impregnate the Pope's Coffers.

2. That there were no other Conditions requir'd for obtaining the Pardon, but Confession, and paying what it might have cost them in a Pilgrimage to Rome; Repentance being not so much as intimated to be any part of the Condition.

3. It's farther Evident from the very next Clause, where it's said, *Super quibuscumque irregularitatibus dispensatur interventu pecunie*, That provided there was Money, they were dispensed with all sorts of irregularities; telling the People that they had in this matter all the Power of binding and loosing, which Christ gave to Peter.

4. This is produced by the Historian, as a gross Abuse; but what

what was there extraordinary in it, if the Indulgence was (as our Author holds) *only for the Relaxation of the Canonical Penances due to Sin*, upon Repentance?

5. This is conformable to what other Authors observe in the like Cases. *Uspersenſis* (as was ſhewed in the *Apology*, p. 44.) relates, that upon the plenary Indulgences then ſent forth, they ſaid, *Let me act what wickedneſs I will, I ſhall by theſe be delivered from Punishment.* And *Eſpenceus* ſaith, That it was evident from their proceedings, That they rather ſought their Money, than their Repentance.

In Tit. Digreſſ. 1. 11. Turpilucr.

By this time, I hope the Doctör is clear'd from *false Tranſlation*, or *perverſe Conſtruction*

However our Author ſaith, That *there is not one Pardon* the Doctör can pretend makes for his intent, *beſides that of Boniface.* But if this be for his intent, there needs no more; yet methinks there are others look broadly this way. What thinks he of the Indulgence granted to him, that ſaith or beareth, or beareth about him, the Prayer (which is there ſaid to be ſhewed to St. *Auguſtine*, by the Revelation of the Holy Ghoſt) that *What he aſketh of God, he ſhall obtain, if it be to the Salvation of his Soul; and when his Soul ſhall depart from his Body, it ſhall not enter into Hell?* Here is mention made only of bearing, or reading, or bearing about him that Prayer. And becauſe he may be aſſured, that it ſhall not ſo be with him, as not to bear or read it; it's there ſaid further, that he ſhall not dye of ſudden Death; and that no expedient be wanting, if he but beareth it about him, he is ſure to eſcape Damnation.

Defence, p. 8.

What can we think again of the Prayer (which they tell us St. *Bernard* daily ſaid, and was written in a Table that hang near to the high Altar in St. Peter's Church at Rome) which, *Whoſo devoutly and daily ſaith with a contrite heart* (and we know what was meant by that in thoſe days) *if he be that day in the ſtate of Eternal Damnation, then this Eternal Pain ſhall be changed him into Temporal Pain of Purgatory, &c. and all his Sins ſhall be forgotten and forgiven, through the infinite Mercy of God.* And how backward ſoever our Author is to acknowledg it, yet this was no ſtrange Doctrin in thoſe merciful days; for ſo *Clement 6.* grants a plenary Indulgence to all that died in the way to Rome, and commands the *Angels of Paradiſe*, to carry the Soul immediately to Heaven.

Ibid. p. 11.

Bulla Clem. 6. Ultraject. A. D. 1653.

Before I leave this, I ſhall offer theſe Conſiderations in Confirmation of what the Doctör aſſerted.

(1.) That



Defence, p. 6.

De Purgat. l.  
1. c. 2. Sect.  
*Ad quintum.*  
Bull. to. 4. p.  
86.

(1.) That Sin is unforfaken, which is unrepented of. That Sin is not repented of, for which, according to them, due Satisfaction has not been made. Due Satisfaction has not been made, when for a Million of years of Punishment due (according to our Author's notion) the reciting of *three Prayers* shall be sufficient for Pardon.

(2.) That Sin is not forsaken, which a Person commits in hope of an Indulgence, and which notwithstanding he Sins in the Expectation of, he shall not forfeit his interest in it.

(3.) That Sin is not forsaken, which a Man dies in; and which he is encouraged to live in, from the hopes of that Indulgence: Such was the state of those in the *Maccabees* (as *Bellarmin* saves it). And such Indulgences have been often granted to Persons at the Point of Death, as *Clement* the 10th did give plenary Indulgence to those, that in that hour call'd upon any of those five Saints he had newly Canonized.

(4.) Sins cannot be presumed to be truly repented of, or forsaken, or could it be thought necessary so to forsake them, when they encouraged themselves to it, from an Expectation of an Indulgence; as *Usspergensis* relates.

(5.) Indulgences do not suppose Sins to be forsaken, or that therein Persons are enjoyn'd to forsake them, when they respect the time to come. Which brings me to the 2d Branch of his Charge.

2. *They have granted Indulgences, even for what they call deadly Sins, for many thousand years to come.* Here are two things asserted by the Doctor. 1. That Indulgences were granted for what they call deadly Sins. 2. That they were granted for many thousand years to come. Here the Doctor complains of our Author, for leaving out the Proof that he produced in his Sermon for it, from the *Horæ B. Virginis*; but our Author has here forgot to give any recompence to the Doctor for that Injury. However, upon this Argument it must be confess'd, that he has acquitted himself beyond all Contradiction, having produced no less than three Indulgences out of that very Book, *for deadly Sins, totiens quotiens*, (as the words are). What Reply doth the *Sayer* make to this, for his own, or his Friend *Mr. Pulson's*, or his Church's Vindication? The matter is drop'd, and the Charge therefore stands in full force upon Record against them. Pass we therefore to the next.

2. Indul-

2. *Indulgences were granted for many thousand years to come.* Here the Doctor insists upon the same Authority, and produces Instance after Instance, of Indulgences granted for such a term of Years, as that of Pope John 22. for 3000 years for deadly Sins, and 3000 for Venial:—That of St. Peter, and thirty other Popes, for 6000 years; of Alexander the 6th, for 10000 years; of Sixtus 4. for 32755 years; and another of John 22. for 1000000 years. And what's this, but for years to come.

To this our Author replies.

1. *This looks like an asserting of the Vulgar Reproach, to wit, That [the Pope can give the Papists leave to Sin for many years to come]; and is the thing he seems willing to imprint on his Readers in all the Instances he has brought, by the way that he handles them.* But here the Doctor imprints no more on his Reader, than the Instances themselves will imprint, for they are in order nakedly propos'd. But supposing he did assert that *Vulgar Reproach*; our Author was once ask'd, and I don't remember he ever answer'd it, *What mighty difference is there, whether a man procures with Money a Dispensation, or a Pardon? For the Sin can hurt him no more, than if he had a License to commit it.* If a Malefactor be sure of a Pardon, after he has committed the Crime, it's as to himself the same, as if he had a Dispensation before-hand for it? And so it has been determined among themselves, That *he that willingly commits a Sin in hope of a Jubile, or an Indulgence afterwards to be granted, doth not lose the benefit of it.* This is a case propos'd by Bellarmin, and which like a cautious Person, he would not interpose in. Here our Author declares, *This is most contradictory to the Doctrine we are taught, and to the received Notion of Indulgences amongst Catholicks, who are so far from presuming upon leave to Sin, upon the grant of Indulgences, that they don't think that any one Sin that is past, can be forgiven by an Indulgence.* But this is *præstatio Contra factum*; where he has been taught his Catholic Doctrine, I know not; but the time has been, when his Catholicks were taught otherwise; Or else, what needed it to have been complain'd of? Thus we are told that the Popes both have given, and their Pardoners have thus told the People, and the People have thus believed, that Indulgences were as well for the time to come, as the time past. And surely the Bulls of the Popes, Paul 3. and Julius 3. to the Fraternity of the Sacrament of the Holy Altar, contains what is Equivalent to it, in which it's provided, that the Brethren may

*Doctrines and Practices, c. 8. p. 64.*

*L. 1. c. 10. de Indulg. Sect. Altera.*

*Review du Concile de Trent. l. 5. c. 1. Gravam. Ger. n. 3. Paris, 1550.*

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

have a dormant Faculty for a plenary Pardon to be used when they please. But for all this, if our Author be to be credited, *They don't think that any one Sin that is past, can be forgiven by an Indulgence.* And in Confirmation of this, he saith, *Indulgences are only for the Relaxation of Canonical Penalties due to Sin, which being assigned by the Church, may likewise by the same Authority be released.* The whole of this matter will be determined by considering what Indulgences are, and to what ends they were design'd, and are esteem'd to serve in their Church.

De Indulgent.  
l. i. c. 7. Sect.  
4. Propositio,  
Cc.

Doctrines and  
Practices, c.  
8. p. 66.

Bullar. To. 3.  
p. 74.

But here I observe, that the Account given by our Author of Indulgences, is the same that is own'd by *Luther and Calvin*, and the rest of the Hereticks, who, saith *Bellarmin*, held, that an *Indulgence amongst the Ancients, was nothing but a Relaxation of the Punishment which the Church commanded.* And which he therefore disputes against by several Arguments; as 1. There would be no need of the Treasure of the Church. 2. That then an Indulgence would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her Children. 3. That they could not be granted for the dead. 4. That many of them, who receive Indulgences, do often, and are sometimes obliged to undergo Canonical Penance. 5. The form of them proves it. This I remember has formerly been put to our Author, and I should be glad to find him to confute *Bellarmin*, or to reconcile *Bellarmin* to him. To this I may add, 6. That Relaxation of Penances, and Remission of Sins, are distinctly provided for in the Indulgences. So in the Bull of *Urban 8.* is a grant not only of Relaxation, but Remission.

But here our Author interposes, and saith, *That they are so far from presuming upon leave to Sin, that they don't think any one Sin that is past, can be forgiven by an Indulgence.* And for this he will be giving a Reason, because saith he, *We are taught that no Sin is forgiven, even in the Sacrament of Confession, without a sincere Repentance.* Whether the latter be true, will remain to be considered under the next Character; but what will a Reason signify against Matter of Fact? For it's still a question, whether Sin is not pretended to be forgiven by Indulgence? And what more common in Indulgences, than a promise of Remission, and plenary Remission? As for that, saith he, *Whoever considers, that they were many times forgiven for many hundred years; nay, as the Doctor bath it [and surely he hath it from themselves] for many thousand*

Thousand years to come, he must soon conclude that this could not be giving leave to sin for so long time to come, which so far exceeds the term of mans life. But though it gives not leave to sin, it's sure a pardon for sin; and he can no more have a pardon for a Thousand years past, who has lived but fifty or sixty, than have an allowance for a Thousand years to come. And the Doctor said not that they grant by Indulgences leave to sin for many Thousand years to come, but that they granted Idulgences for many Thousand years to come. But what saith our Author to these prodigious numbers of years? It's, saith he, only the releasing of Penances, which being assign'd in proportion to the sins, for some sins three years penance; for others five; might with some careless Christians amount to that degree, that for fifty years of life, they might possibly have 5000 years penalties due to their sins. And we shall add for him, the 32000 of Sixtus the 4th. and the ten hundred thousand of John the 22th. Well, supposing this account of it to be right, and that an Indulgence is only a relaxation of such Penances as are due to the offence: Yet, what a leave, or at least encouragement is here given to sin, when a man that has deserved to undergo 5000 or 30000, or ten hundred thousand years of Penance, shall by a Bull of a Pope be discharged from all this for saying three short Prayers, or five Pater-Nosters, five Aves, and a Credo? But supposing the Sinner is so careless also, that after that he has run up the score to so high a sum, he has not procured such an Indulgence, and that the 5000, and the ten hundred thousand years Penalties remain due, where is it that he is to undergo these Penalties? And where is it that the Church in his notion, appoints, assigns, and inflicts them? After all, methinks he had better have said, with some of their own Church, that the Relaxation doth not avail, as far as is promised, but it's so declared, that the Faithful might be excited to give, and the Church deceives them.

*Altridor. Sum.  
l. 4. Sc.*

Thirteenth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

This he distributes into nine Particulars:

1. If he be false and deceitful to Mankind, yet Euge bone serve, all is well, and he in an instant is thought worthy of a better Kingdom. This he saith is absolutely false. For this he gives two Reasons, 1. That Falshood and deceit are no where recommended or taught by his Church. As if his Church would directly establish such Propositions. And yet the

Char. 13.

H

Council

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Council of Constance comes near it, when it asserts, *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* 2. He saith, *I am certain no man of what Church soever so guilty, can have admittance there, but by a sincere repentance and restitution. This is the received Doctrine of his Church, and I hope in their dealing they practice it as much as any.* Here he turns off the case in hand from the publick to the private state of affairs, and has not one word in vindication of what the *Apologist* laid to their charge, especially in that notorious instance of the Pope's solemn Oration made in the Conclave in commendation of the Assassination of Henry the Third of France.

As our Author has here broke one sentence of the Preacher's from another, and set in the midst what belongs to the Sermon of Alms: So he has wholly omitted Assertion 14th. in the *Apology*, viz. *If the Pope and his Emissaries say the right hand is the left, the Papists are bound to believe it;* which is there made good by four several Arguments. But here our Author is modest, and has left it to shift for it self, and his Church under the heavy charge of it.

Serm. p. 3r,  
32, 33.

2. *No man can be a Papist, but he whose eyes are blinded by Education, or he who puts his own eyes out by Atheism.* It's in the Sermon, *No man Therefore can be a Papist, &c.* which refers to what was there before said, and the description the Preacher had given of Popery, viz. 1. That the Pope can dispence with the *Laws of Nature, and against the Old and New Testament.* 2. That the Word of God is a *Nose of Wax, a Dumb Judge, and dead Ink.* 3. That the Pope is another God upon Earth, and that if he declares the right hand is the left, we ought to believe him. And then follows, *No man therefore can be a Papist, but, &c.* The Question here is not about the Lives of Papists (as our Author would have it) but about the character of Popery: And then it remains to be considered, whether the Preacher was right in his representation of it, and in the Authorities he produces for it. But instead of bringing the case to an issue, our Author in his *Good Advice*, left out what went before, and the Marginal Quotations of what he cited from the Sermon, and now has offer'd no manner of Reply to, nor so much as taken notice of the *Apologist's* Argument.

3. *The Council of Trent expresseth its allowance of picturing the Divinity it self, and accordingly the Pictures of the Trinity are ordinarily to be beheld in the Popish Churches.* This is a new point our Author has substituted; perhaps thinking this look's somewhat better



better than an Answer to that he has omitted ; but yet I shall take it in my way. Here the Preacher, 1. Appeals to their Doctrine, and for which he quotes the Council of Trent.

2. To their practice and use.

As to the first, our Author saith, *it's false*, since the Council delivers just the contrary, taking care that if it happens that the Histories of the Holy Scriptures be painted or figured, that the people be taught, the Divinity is not therefore figur'd or painted, as if that could be seen with corporeal eyes, or represented in colours. Sess. 25.

Now here I observe, 1. Our Author represents the case as if the Picturing of God and the Trinity in their Churches was much like what Aaron pleads for the Golden Calf, *I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf* ; as if it was what they find in their Churches, have been placed there by they know not whom, and are like those that are to be seen, it seems, in the frontispiece of some Bibles and Common-Prayer-Books of the Church of England, that come from an obscure uncertain hand ; but what they themselves do not regard. If it happens, &c. saith the Council ; thus far indeed our Author goes with the Council, but why did he leave out what immediately follows, and why did he not read it as the Council reads it ? *If it happens that sometimes the Histories and Narrations of Scripture be Painted or Figured (when that shall be expedient for the unlearned people.)* So that it's not an accidental thing, but designedly done, as an Expedient for instructing the unlearned people.

But however the Preacher saith that of the Council, which the Council denies, that they picture the Divinity it self ; but doth he say, that they picture what they themselves believe to be the Picture of the Divinity ? No surely, then he had contradicted the Council, and made them downright *Antropomorphites* ; but he lays it to their charge that they picture and make Representations of the Divinity and Trinity it self, as well as of Saints, that is, not sparing even the Divinity. O but, saith the Council, *these are only Histories of the Holy Scriptures*. But is there any History of Scripture that tells us God did so appear in any Form, otherwise than in a Prophetical Scheme ? And is not even that forbidden when an Image of God is forbidden, because God cannot be described in any way but by what he is not ; and so is a reason against Images in all, as well as any one Instance ; and of which none can be proposed but what fall under the same condemnation ?

demnation? As for what he hath seen in the *Frontispiece* of some *Bibles* and *Common-Prayer Books*, they belong no more to our Church, than the Temple of *Pallas* to the *Roman Church*, though existent in it. If indeed they were as commonly to be seen in our Churches, were allow'd, were set up by order, and ador'd; if he could find it defended, and the benefit they are of to the people, set forth in the Articles and Catechism of our Church, then he had something to say; but till that, he is guilty of a gross Misrepresentation, and in his common phrase, of an *Absolute Falshood*, that saith, that the *Præcher's* Exclamation of, *O hateful sight!* may be as properly apply'd to any thing of that nature in our Churches.

Entretiens de  
Philaethe,  
Sc. p. 2. p. 160,  
Sc.  
Orat. Propr.

4. He prays to Images. This, saith he, is false too, for several Reasons: (1.) Because they are taught to pray to God alone, but to none else. Is that all? It must be acknowledged they go a little further, for they desire the Intercession of such holy persons as are acceptable to God, whether in Heaven or Earth? But do they no otherwise desire the Intercession of Holy persons in Heaven, than they do those in Earth? Do they ask, suppose, of a Confessor to be delivered from the chain of their sins, to be preserved from spiritual maladies, and Hell-fire, and to be prepar'd for Heaven, &c. as they ask of the Saints? Or do they so much as pray to God, that he would grant that by the Merits and Prayers of their Confessor, as well as St. Andrew, they may be delivered from the Fire of Hell?

(2.) He saith, For Images, we confess them to be nothing but wood and stone. Will he be so bold as to say this, nothing but wood, after they are Consecrated? Let our Author consult *Papist Represented and not Misrepresented*, Chap. 1. And will he deny that they are Representatives, and to be applied to as if the Objects Represented were present? If he doth, why has he not bestow'd a little of his pains in chastising the *Apologist*? But it seems the *Apologist* however has laid himself open in going farther, for he speaks of leaving prayers with an Image. And why not as well as pray to them? Let him state the matter, and confute this, and I'll promise him the *Apologist* shall then give up the former. But what's become of the *Christus in Imagine*, in *Curius*? Surely the City of *Lucca* will take it ill at his hands, that he has not a word to say in behalf of their famous Image, and the veracity of their Historian. Here I shall refer the *Sayer* to what has been already said, *Char. 9. n. 2*. I shall take his excuse that he makes; for his

perversion of the Preacher's sense, though it had been a little more sincere, if he had positively acknowledged his fault, rather to come off with an *If*, when the case is evident.

5. *He worships Bread and Wine, not as Representations of God, but as God himself.* This, saith he, is false, since we worship only God himself, and not the Bread and Wine, which we believe not to be in the Blessed Sacrament. And then he comes in with his charge of Misrepresenting, and gravely adds a good Rule from a worthy hand. But all is spoiled for want of proof that the Preacher doth charge it upon them, that they believe first of all the Bread and Wine to be in the Sacrament: and yet worship it as God himself. But the Preacher speaks not of what they believed, but what they did, as is plain by the Negative he inserts, viz. *Here you see the Bread and Wine are worshipped by them, not as Representations of God, which the Bread and Wine are, but as God himself.* The Preacher shews the grossness of their practice, that what is indeed but Bread and Wine in their Substance, and a Representation of our Saviour, they worship as God himself. The former is what the thing is in it self, the latter he charges upon them as their practice. And therefore the Sayer first mistakes the case, and then proceeds to spend a censure upon it.

6. *He is taught, that the Passion of Christ takes away only the guilt of Mortal sins, but not the eternal punishment.* Here the Apologist took some little pains to state the Case, and proceeded upon these Heads, to shew in their way, 1. That the Guilt may be taken away, when the punishment is not. 2. That the Guilt may be taken away by one cause, and the eternal punishment by another. 3. That the Passion of Christ only takes away the Guilt of Mortal sins, but doth not take away the eternal punishment. Here it might be expected our Author would have enter'd into the Merits of the Cause, but instead of that, saith, *it's false*; gives us a short reason or two, and dismisses the point, and leaves the Apology without a word of Reply.

7. *He is taught the non-necessity of Repentance before the imminent point of death.* This is another new point scor'd up to the account of the Preachers, and was none of the twenty eight Assertions in the *Advice*. But however, I shall try whether the Preacher had not Authority for it.

Here

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Here our Author offers two things: 1. *That it's absolutely contrary to the Doctrine and general practice of their Church, whose Members are obliged to go to Confession once a year, which cannot be perform'd without a hearty Repentance.* 2. *We hear nothing so much discomfited of in our Books and Sermons, as deferring Repentance to the last.* I will not undertake for their Sermons, for I am not so conversant in theirs, as he is in ours; but in their Books we find, 1. *That they are taught that they are not bound to repent but in the danger or point of death.* So Navar, who affirms it to be *the sense of all.* 2. *That though the Church calls upon them to repent at solemn times, as Easter, yet the Church is satisfied in the Ritual performance of it, and that true inward Repentance is not thereby requir'd.* 3. *That to defer our Repentance, is but a venial sin.* 4. *This is conformable to the Doctrine of the Church, which teaches that Absolution with Attrition is equivalent to Confession.* Of this see *Char. 14. n. 2.*

8. *The bare saying of Prayers, without either minding what he says, or understanding it, is sufficient to the Divine acceptance.*

9. *So he is to appear before God dumb and senseless, like one of his Idols.*

Our Author observes here, that *it seems by the Apologizer this saying of the Preacher is not charged upon us as a profess'd Doctrine of ours, but only as a consequence of his own Head; and from whence does he draw it? From this suppos'd principle, viz. the Romish Church enjoins the saying Prayers in a Language unknown to the Generality of the people.* The Chain as here represented, is wholly a Fiction. For after the *Apologizer* had charged him with a partial Relation of the Preacher's sense, he thus concludes, *So that what the Adverser quotes is (not a consequence infer'd from a principle, as he saith, but) a particular of the foregoing General, the Preacher telling his Auditors, that meer Works done in Acts of Devotion in the Church of Rome is, in the opinion of that Church, sufficient to Divine Acceptance; This he fortifies with an Instance, as it is in bare saying of Prayers without either minding what they say, or understanding it. And he goes on: And agreeably herewith the Romish Church enjoins the saying them in a Language not understood, &c.* So far is it either from our Author's consequence, or a principle from whence it's infer'd. But here our Author slips away from the Argument of the *Apologizer*, which brought him to the exigence of owning himself a Falsifier as to his charge against the Preacher;

or

*Encbir. c. 1.  
n. 31.*

*Reginaldus de  
Contrit. l. 2.*

*c. 4.  
Soto in 4 Sent.  
Dist. 17. q. 2.  
Art. 6. Concl.  
24.*

or a Defenter and Condemner of his own Church. But why doth he now call [*the enjoying of a Prayer in a Language unknown to the People*] a *supposed Principle*? Is it not enjoyed? There he is silent. But what if the Priests do not understand? So it has been; so *Nic. Clemangis* saith, *We see Priests almost universally have much ado to read, without understanding the Sense or the Words*; so *Billet, &c.* And what if the Priests do understand it? Is it therefore understood by the People? But why doth he instance in *Misals* translated for *Vulgar use*? That sure he should be cautious in, for it's an attempt stands reprobated by a great Authority, as the *Seed-plot of Disobedience, Sedition, Schism, &c.* Now which is in the right, *Pope Alexander the 7th*, who thus condemn'd and forbad it; or our Author, who saith, *The People have the same in English*; and what will become both of Priests that allow it, and People that use it, when the *Anathema* of the Council of *Trent* is also against it, (as *Salmoron*, and others declare) I shall leave as I find it. From thence our Author runs to the *Mass*, which he saith, *being a Sacrifice rather than a Prayer, the Attention and Devotion of the People doth not so much consist in the Words, said by the Priest, as in what is done by him.* But is there in the *Mass* nothing but the Oblation, nothing but Action? Are there no Prayers? That he dares not say, he only softens, *it's not so much, it's rather.* And what does this signify to these parts of the Service, which are not of that kind? Where then is the Devotion and Attention, when there is no Understanding? Where the Acceptance, when there is neither Attention or Devotion? Let him consider what the *Apologist* said, p. 37, 39. and then he will find his Appeal to their Practice to be of no Service to him. When all is said, he has lost the Argument about the Acceptance of Prayer not understood, and which the *Apologist* offer'd him Authorities for. But here he supposes he has him at Advantage; and tho he lets go *Tolet* and *Salmoron*, yet he charges him home with *somewhat worse than Ignorance, for making the Representer an Abetter of such unreasonable Doctrine, [that to say Prayers well and devoutly, 'tis not necessary to have Attention not on the Words or Sense] when he has left out the following Words, [But rather purely on God.]* It's an Omission, I confess, a fault frequent with himself. I heartily wish our Author as clear of Abetting what he calls the *unreasonable Doctrine*, as the *Apologist* is of Contrivance; who may therefore justly return his own words in a charge somewhat worse, *I can assure him, 'twas not design,*

C. 16.  
In *Cassandri*  
*Liturg.*

*Collectio quorundam*  
*Auth. cum decretis*  
*Par. 1661.*

In 1 Cor. 16.  
Disp. 30.

Sayings, p. 47.

but



*but mistake only.* In justice to him, let us put it in, yet I don't see the case at all amended; *Attention purely on God*, being a distinct thing from *Attention on the Prayers*. And if he says his Prayers without attending to the *Words or Sense*, whether he *thinks purely on God*, or thinks on anything else, yet he is no more at these his Prayers with his mind, than if he were not at Prayers. For what are Prayers in publick but the Words and Sense? And what makes them our Prayers, but Attention to the Words and Sense? So that Prayers without Attention, are much at one with Prayers without Understanding: And those are Prayers without Attention, where the Words and Sense of the Prayers are not attended to. Well, this saith our Author, *is unreasonable Doctrine, That to say say Prayers well and devoutly, 'tis not necessary to have Attention on the Words and Sense.* And I hope 'tis *unreasonable Doctrine* then, that to say Prayers well and devoutly, 'tis not necessary to understand either Words and Sense. And yet this is approv'd Doctrine in their Church; for saith *Salmeron*, *Prayers are like the Words of a Charmer, they prevail even when they are not understood.* I hope again, 'tis *unreasonable Doctrine*, that in Prayer, 'tis not necessary to attend to the Sense; nor so much as to consider he is present before God: And yet no less than Cardinal *Tolet* so determines. By this time, I hope both Preacher and Vindicator are set right in our Author's good Opinion as to this matter. Proceed we.

Sum. par. 3.  
tit. 13.

Instruct. Sa-  
cer. c. 13. n. 5, 6.

Here I expected a round Charge against Assertion 20th, that they avowedly allow what God positively forbids. It's blunt and home, and what the *Apologist* makes good; but this is a dry Doctrine, and so he substitutes a new one in the place.

Char. 14.

#### Fourteenth Character of a Pulpit-Papist.

Under this are reduced seven Particulars.

1. To cover his Idolatry he commits Sacrilege, steals away one of the Ten Commandments, and by their Index Expurgatorius, blots the two Tables themselves.

This is a new Charge, brought to the Account, but I shall give it some Consideration. This Charge, he saith, is not sincere. 1. Because they have the Ten Commandments in their Bibles and Catechism. 2. If they are set short in some little Abstracts of Christian Doctrine, it's in Compliance to the Weakness of some Memories and Capacities,

*Capacities, setting down only the Words of the Precept, without the Addition of Threats, Promises or Explications.*

In the first of these he would insinuate, as if the 2d Commandment is never expunged by them, which he dares not stand to. If it be expunged elsewhere, to what purpose doth he refer us to the Bible and Catechisms? For if it be in the Bible and Catechisms, but not in the Offices of the Church, it's still a true Charge against them. And I remember it was both shew'd, that it was not in several of their Offices, and it was put to him, to shew in *what publick Offices of their Church it is to be found.* But however, *it is in their Bibles,* but what is this to those that have not the use of the Bible permitted to them? However, *it is in their Catechisms.* Surely our Author is not sincere. For he once confess'd it to be left out in their *short Catechisms;* or if he is improv'd since that time in his Confidence, I will produce Catechism after Catechism, where it is not; such as the *Child's Catechism,* 1678. And as for the Abstracts, even in those the two first Commandments are thrust into one, and often there is nothing at all of the second, but an &c. in the place, as in the *Abstract of the Scripture Catechism,* An. 1675; which I suppose is that which he himself refers to, p. 57.

*Doctrines and Practices, c. 25. p. 123.*

*Pap. Misrep. c. 25.*

2. For his Absolution, 'tis not necessary he should be sorry for his Sin, but only for the Penance. Here I presumed our Author would have expiated upon the point, and have clear'd their Church (if he could) from the Imputation charged upon them by the Preacher, and maintain'd by the Apologist; who shew'd from the Council of Trent, their Catechism, and the Practice of their Church, that a Sorrow for the Penance alone (or Attrition) with Confession to the Priest, is sufficient without Contrition; but to all this, our Author gives no Reply.

3. If this should fail, 'tis but being at the Charge of an Indulgence, or Pope's Pardon; that is, to purchase so many penny-worth of other mens Merits: And this is what is requir'd instead of Regeneration, Sanctification, and a Godly Life. This, saith our Author, involves an absolute Falsity; whilst it supposes that a Papist, who is sorry neither for his Sins, nor the Punishment that attends them, has no more to do than to procure the Pope's Pardon; and that this is sufficient instead of Repentance. This is a most abominable Doctrine in it self, and most injuriously charg'd upon us. And yet as abominable Do-

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Strive as it is, it's found and prov'd upon them by the *Apologist*, from the Indulgences granted in their *Crusado's*, and upon other Occasions. But saith our *Sayer*, *The only ground for it, is the Practice of some profligate Men*, in the number of which he must then place several of his Popes. But to all the Evidence for this, our Author saith not a Word. Of this, let the Reader see before, *Char. 12.*

4. *Auricular Confession, their great Intelligencer, and Leiger Nuntio, is the main Curb of the Laity, whereby the Clergy holds them in awe, in being admitted to all their Secrets of States and Families, thereby to work their Purposes and Plots: 'tis a matter of meer Interest; and were there no gain in it, they would be ashamed of it.*

Of this, he saith, *It's a most odious Character of an Institution allowed, even in the Church of England.* What, is their Auricular Confession, as it's described from the Council of *Trent* in the *Apology*, *an Institution of the Church of England?* Doth the Church of *England* hold it necessary, *jure Divino*, to Confess to the Priest, all and singular mortal Sins, even the most Secret, whether Acts, Thoughts or Desires, with all their Circumstances, so far as may change the nature of the Sin; and without doing which, no Absolution is to be given? He may as well say, *Transubstantiation* is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, because they own the Eucharist, as their Auricular Confession is an Institution of our Church, because it allows and approves Confession in some cases. But, what saith our Author to the Charge? What to the use made of it in intruding into the *Secrets of States and Families*, and to work their Projects? What to the Allegations from their own Historians? Here the old Refuge is made use of, Silence. Of this, see before, *Char. 9. n. 3.*

5. *Ignorance is the Mother of their Devotion, which they are bound to by Vow, and under the severest Penalties.* This, saith our Author, *is a great Calumny, and an empty Consequence of the Preacher.* Methinks our Author should not be so brisk upon this Sermon, which he has made so extremely bold with, sometimes mollifying the Sense of it, (when it looks too broad upon them) at other times sharpening it, leaving out and altering, as it was here, when he made the Preacher say, before, they are bound to *vow Ignorance.* This, he saith, *the Apologizer pretends to make out.* But

But if it be but *Pretence*, why has not the *Sayer* expos'd him, and run down the Instances of *St. Benediſt*, *Francis*, *Ignatius Loyala*? I acknowledg the Learning of many of their Fryers and Monks, but they are not beholding to their Vows and Rules for their Learning: For the more they keep to them, the leſs Learned they will be; or elſe I know not why the Jeſuits are not as ſtrictly tied up to their Hours, &c. as the *Benedictines*. But what is become of Aſſertion 25. *Their avowed Principles are to keep the People in Ignorance*? Where are we to expect the Answer to what the *Apologiſt* there produced in Confirmation of it? That's reſerved to a more convenient time. See before, *Char. 8.*

Here again, we want an Answer to what was ſaid on Aſſertion 26. *They teach their People better Manners, than to rely upon the all-ſufficient Merits of Chriſt.* All which the *Apologiſt* did undertake to prove upon them.

But inſtead of that, our Author throws in a new Inſtance to make up the Defect, *viz.*

6. *They muſt wholly ſubmit their Reason to an Infallible Judg, even ſo far (if one of their greateſt Authors ſay true) as to be bound to believe Virtue to be Bad, and Vice to be Good, if it ſhall pleaſe his Holineſs to ſay ſo.* This, ſaith he, is a groſs *Abuſe* of Bellarmin. But firſt of all, what ſaith he to the general Propoſition, That they *muſt wholly ſubmit their Reason to the Infallible Judg*? Is that an *Abuſe* of their Church? And ſetting aſide Bellarmin for the preſent; Is there none of his groſs Doctrines to be found elſewhere? What thinks he, if the Pope ſhould declare the right Hand is the left, are they bound to believe it? This was once call'd a Miſrepresentation in the Preacher, but their own *Lyra* was beforehand with him (tho our Author had the good manners to leave out the Quotation). What thinks he of the Rule of *Ignatius*, That if the *Catholic Church* define that to be black, which appears to be white, they are bound to account it to be black? What thinks he of meriting by believing an Heretical Propoſition taught by his Biſhop? Theſe are Caſes reſolved by them in the Affirmative, as the *Apologiſt* ſhew'd in the place quoted by our Author; but tho nothing could be objected againſt thoſe, and the like Evidences, yet it ſeems this is a moſt groſs *Abuſe* of Bellarmin, an *inexcusable Aſperſion*, a *Forgery* of the Preacher. But, why all this? Becauſe, ſaith he, theſe words are not his *Aſſertion*, but an *Inconvenience* he argues from, in proof of what he had before aſſerted, that the Pope is

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery ;

*Infallible.* But if it be an *Inconvenience*, it's what he is contented should be taken for an *Affertion*. It's plainly a case he puts, The general Proposition in proof indeed was, that the *Pope could not err in things of themselves good and evil, as it's a matter of Faith (the Catholick Faith teaching Virtue to be good, and Vice to be evil.)* The next Proposition in confirmation of it is, that the Church is bound to believe according to the Pope's Resolution of the case, *Unless she would sin against conscience.*

The next is, supposing that the Pope should command Vice and forbid Virtue; then, faith he, the Church is bound to acquiesce in his judgment in all doubtful matters, to do what he commands, and not do what he forbids; and lest perhaps she act against conscience, she is bound to believe that to be good which he commands, and that evil which he forbids. That the Pope cannot err, is the Principle he holds to; but yet to secure the duty of the people, he breaks off the Argument, and lets it all issue in the point of the Churches obedience and submission, lest they should at last find his Holiness has thus err'd. Well, faith he, however if it should be so, yet, as he said before in another case, *it belongs not to Subjects to doubt of these things, but simply to obey.* And how timorous soever our Author is to own it, how solicitous to bury it under the rubbish of *Abuses, Aspersions, and Forgeries*; yet others are not so bashful. Even Bellarmin himself elsewhere doth admit it, with some little qualification, *In a good sense,* faith he, *Christ gave to Peter the power of making sin not to be a sin, and of what was not sin, to be sin.* Bellarmin indeed saw further than our Author: he knew well, that these Metamorphoses had been practised by the Papal Authority, and if they were bound to believe that to be good which he commands, and approve that which he decrees, when what was in it self unlawful was made lawful by his determination, there was no disputing. Of this we have a notable instance in Pope Martin the Fifth, who after mature consultation, did dispense with one that had taken his Sister to Wife, because of the Scandals that otherwise must have happen'd upon their Separation.

7. *Their Church-men must live a single life, whether honestly or no, it makes no matter.* Our Author after his wonted manner, declares this to be utterly false; it being no indifferent thing in our Church whether the Clergy live honestly or no. In this Assertion the Apologist observed there were two Points contained: 1. That  
the

Sect. ac ut  
rem.

C. 13 in Bark-  
laim.

Antonini  
Summa.



the Clergy in the Church of *Rome* must and are obliged by the Order of their Church, and their own Vow, to lead a single life.

2. That there is more care taken that they live single, than that they live honestly. But this faith our Author is to *fall much below the Preacher*; but why so, what mighty difference is there betwixt saying, as the Preacher, that whether they can do it *honestly, it makes no matter*; or *more care is taken that they live single, than that they live honestly*? For certainly not much matter is made of that, which they take no reasonable care in. But however he will not allow the proof of it offer'd in the Apology; *Which, faith he, is this chiefly, because the punishment for a Clergyman that marries, is much greater than for one that keeps his Concubine.* The matter of fact he allows, and indeed it was undeniably prov'd against them. But this, he faith, is not to the purpose, it being as if I should say, that according to the Principles of the Church of England, it matters not, whether her Members turn Turks, or no: *And then should bring this for proof, because she has severe penalties, even of death it self for such as become Papists, but none at all for those that turn Turks.* But this is far from the case; for Laws are made according to the state and exigence of Affairs, and the Cases that fall out, or probably may fall out, and the damage done thereby to the Community: But where there is no danger or damage in prospect, it's a ridiculous thing to make a Law. The danger here was from the Papists, and their practices against the Government, which was the reason of those Laws: but there is no danger of the Members of its Church turning *Turks*, which is the reason why there is no Law against it. And his Argument would be much as if it should be said, That according to the Principles of the *Greek Church* it matters not, whether her Members turn Heathens; and then should bring this for proof of it, because she has severe Penalties, even death it self for those that turn *Turks* (for they that so turn are not received into the Church without as openly renouncing, as they profess *Mahometism*, which is death) but none at all for those that turn Heathens. If he had put the case right, it should have been thus, That by the Laws of *England* it is death to turn Papist, and a Fine of 10*s.* to turn *Turk*, in the same circumstances of danger; then it had look'd speciously enough that they took more care that they should not turn Papists, than *Turks*. And so we have brought the case home. For if when  
a Clergy-

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

a Clergy-man is found married, he must be separated or depriv'd; but if he keeps a Concubine, he is Fin'd but 10 s; it's evident, which is the worst crime in the opinion of the Church of *Rome*. Our Author saith, This was the *chief* Argument of the *Apologist*; and if so, methinks when he had dismiss'd this by a comparison, he might at once have blown off what remains. But though he has not thought fit to set the rest before the Reader, yet I shall offer them to his Consideration. In further confirmation of this Charge, the *Apologist* appeal'd to their Allowances, as Priests Marriage is absolutely forbid without any Relaxation or Dispensation; but Concubinage has been openly allow'd and licens'd; it's further confirmed by their Resolution of the Case, when they account Concubinage and Fornication a less sin in a Priest than Marriage. These, it seems, were inconsiderable; so neither the Argument, nor the Authorities vouch'd for them, deserved an Answer. And for company our Author has dismiss'd also *Assertion 28. viz. The reason why the Clergy are bound to live single, is for fear lest having Wives and Children they should give the State security of their Obedience to their Sovereign.*

I have now done with our Author's 14 Characters, which consist partly of matter of Fact and Observation, partly of Doctrine of their own, and partly of Inferences from, and Arguings upon them. In the two former of which (which are the proper Subject of Representation) I have shew'd there has been nothing charged upon them by the Preachers as to Principle, Practice or Fact, which they had not good Evidence for; and was so far from being a Fiction of their own, that they condemn them out of their own mouths. As for the latter, it belongs not to the Case before us; but yet that nothing might be wanting to give our Author satisfaction, the Arguments produced by the Preachers against the Church of *Rome* have been considered, and justified. So that in Conclusion I may here challenge him to shew that there is any Principle or Doctrine, which is not a Principle of theirs; or a Practice, which is not a Practice; or a Consequence which is not truly inferr'd from them. I do not think that a *Misrepresentation* can be justly chargeable upon a mere Mistake, no more than it is upon the inconsequence of an Argument: But it's a Wonder to me, that amongst the *Ten thousand*

and Pulpits, ( as he reckons them ) and the multitude of Writers in the Church of England, and under all the Provocations they have met with, and in the heat of Argument, there can be nothing material produced against them, notwithstanding the utmost diligence could be used, and the reading of Volumes of Sermons on purpose to make a Discovery.

Were they indeed guilty of Misrepresentation, and that there was No praying to Images in the Church of Rome ; No compound-  
ing with Heaven for Unforsaken Sins ; No worshipping Bread and Wine, as God himself ; No saying Prayers without Attention ; No Divisions among themselves ; No renouncing their Senses, &c. Yet we know where these would be match'd, when our Adversaries tell us, *The Protestants have no God, no Faith, no Religion ; but are meer Atheists, and worship the Devil, as Posseline and Prateolus teach. That to run down Popery, tho he know nothing of it, is to be a true Son of the Church of England. That Interest and Passion puts the Preachers upon arguing in Defiance to their own Conscience, (which our Author, it seems, knows better than themselves). Or as a late Author, That Libertinism is the sole Profession, and the very soul of all Sectaries ; [ that is, those that are not in Communion with the Church of Rome ] That the false Church [ that is, all but themselves ] and Religion, bath no other but vile Hypocrites. That it Professeth the broad and large way leading to Destruction, granting Libertinism to the highest degrees of Wickedness in one kind or another. Into which, whoever enters, forsaking the true, begins presently to leave all Goodness, and becomes an outcast and scum of the Earth, as to all Wickedness and Profaness. That it enjoys no true Spirituality, but brainsick Phancy ; and there was never any sound Spiritual Book written by them. They have the Lord in their Mouth, but their hearts are far from him. That by reason of its wicked Obstinacy and Libertinism, it brings all the Professors thereof to Disobedience, and takes away all neighbourly Love and just Dealing one with another, and hereby bringing Ruin and Confusion upon all Commonwealths, &c.*

See the View,  
p. 106, &c.  
See before, p.  
4.  
Sayings, p. 53.

The Mirror of  
Truth, p. 10,  
12, &c. 1688.

If so much had been said of the Church of Rome ; what a rout had here been ? What a mustering up of Misrepresentations, Calumnies and Abuses ? What arguing in Defiance to their own Conscience ? But I will here excuse the Author of the *Mirror*, for he that can be so ignorant, as to tell us, that the Creed of Pius 4th (which he at large rehearses) was the constant Profession of Faith in the days of Austin the Monk, An. 596. and can quote that

Mirror, p. 15.  
17.

Monk's

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

Monk's Letter to Pope Gregory for it, may, for ought I know, think as he writes, and so his Representations of the Sectaries, and of the Profession of Pope Gregory's Faith be equally true, and what he equally understands.

But our Author is not alike excusable: For whatever he may know concerning the Days of *Austin* the Monk, I know not; but what he writes about, belongs more to his own, and so if he falls in with Misrepresentation, his Conscience must be the more concerned: And which after all he is so far from making good, that he is forced to use all the Shifts that one conscious to himself of infirmity, and subtle enough to conceal it, can contrive; which for a Conclusion to the whole, I shall now a little enquire into.

1. The first Artifice he uses, is Disclaiming and Renouncing, after this manner, *If to be a Papist, is to be that which is describ'd in these Characters; I declare, I am none, and that I am so far from undertaking Apologies for men of such Practices and Beliefs, that I here profess a hearty Detestation of all such Engagements.*— *If this was so, I concluded I had certainly fall'n into the very mouth of Hell-Do-*
- Epistle to the Reader. *ctrines, I as much abhor, as Hell and Damnation it self. If this be to be a Papist; then certainly, to be a Papist, is to be the worst of Men.*— *And 'tis so far from being a doubt, whether he be a Christian, that 'tis certain he can be none; and that if he be bound to believe and live according to the Principles here laid down, he can have no right to Salvation.*— *Whatever Church would receive him with the Profession of all those scandalous Doctrines the Pulpits charge against us, I would be sure to be no Member of it; and if there were no other, but that Church amongst Christians, I would then begin to look towards*
- Sayings, p. 54. *Turkey.* Nay, he advances further, *Whoever will be a good Papist, must instead of assenting to, disclaim every point that is here set down by the Pulpits, as Articles of his Religion.* Let us now try our Author, in some one of these Scandalous and Abominable Doctrines, who comes thus arm'd Cap-a-pie, with Detestations, Abhorrencies, Disclaimings, and see whether he be invulnerable. What thinks he of the first of those, he calls, *Follies and Abominations, viz. praying to Images, and attributing Satisfaction and Expiation to a Crucifix of Wood and Stone?* What doth he think of the Office of Consecration, where it's pray'd that God would bless the *Wood of the Cross; that it may be a saving Remedy to Mankind, a Stability of Faith, the Redemption of Souls, &c?* How
- P. 56.
- To the Reader.
- To the Reader.
- See before Char. 9.
- †
- would

would he behave himself in the Company of Cardinal Capisucci, who maintains that the Worship is to the Image? How in the presence of the Arch-Bishop of Bourdeaux, who defended the Curate's, to the Word, the Wood, against Imbert's, to Christ, and not to the Wood? Could he bear up to them, and tell them it's Infamous, that they are no Christians, and have no right to Salvation? Which doth he think would there be the Misrepresenter, our Author that Dooms this to the Pit of Hell, or those that defend it? Of this Artifice, see the View, p. 51.

2. Another Artifice is to confound the Consequences drawn by the Protestants from their Principles, with their Principles, and to make the Consequence to be their Principle. This he was formerly tax'd with in Doct. and Pract. and View, p. 63. And yet he proceeds still in the same order. So because they are accus'd of Idolatry, therefore he makes that to be part of the Character of a Papist, and then disavows it. Thus he saith, *Were Popery so foul as 'tis in the Opinion of the Vulgar; did it teach Men Idolatry, to worship any Creature for God, to neglect the Commandments, I would chuse rather to be a Jew, Turk, or Infidel, than a Papist.* All which signifies nothing, unless the Papist should believe himself to be an Idolater.

To the Reader, p. 9.

3. We must beware again, that we follow him not too close, or think after all these Disclaimings and Abhorings, that he is plainly to be understood; for there are certain Reserves and Expositions carefully couch'd in, that he may retire to upon occasion. Such as these, *A Papist is bound to disclaim every point here set down, as Articles of his Religion, and as they are obliged to the Profession of them, so to believe and live——according to the Form asserted in the Characters, as here set down.* So that tho they are never so plainly prov'd upon them; yet if they are not Articles of his Religion, nor what they are obliged to believe and do, or agree not precisely with the Form, and as set down in the Characters, he may safely abhor, detest and damn them.

To the Reader, p. 1, 2, 3. P. 54.

4. If he be press'd home, and the Authorities come thick, or the Practice and use be urg'd a little too close; he has yet a relief. I found, saith he, a great number of Matters of Fact, as Massacres, Usurpations, Murders of Princes, Treasons, Plots, Conspiracies, Persecutions, and other such unwarrantable Practices, charg'd against the Members of this Church [of Rome.] I found again the vicious and scandalous Lives of some of her chief Prelates, their Pride, Covetousness and Luxury, laid home; as likewise the ill Examples of other Ecclesiastical Dignitaries, as

To the Reader, p. 11, 12.



## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery;

of Cardinals, Bishops, Priests; their Ignorance, Simony, Oppression, Cruelties, Excesses, &c. Then the loose and extravagant Opinions of many of her Doctors. Lastly, many Superstitions and Abuses found amongst the People, their being impos'd upon by some with idle Inventions, the noise of Relicks and Miracles, and being Priest-ridden a thousand other ways. This is in truth a Charge, as he saith, laid home. It's worth attending, how he brings himself off; why, Here, saith he, I began to lay aside all Trouble and Scruples concerning my Religion, being now well satisfied; How, that all this was false? Not so quick, but that the frightful Character, which surprized me before, (the matter of which it seems is true) was not taken from her Faith and Doctrine, but only from the Vice and Wickedness of such, who tho perchance in her Communion, yet follow'd her Direction: And that 'twas rather a black Record of as many villanous Practices, as ever had been committed by any of her Members, sham'd upon the People. What, as false? That he dares not say; but for a draught of such things the Church taught, encourag'd and approv'd. What work is here for a Protestant Representer? A Bed-roll of Abominations! But saith our Author by way of Prevention and Alleviation, It's a Character taken from the Vice and Wickedness of such, who were perchance in her Communion. How! Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, but perchance in her Communion. Has our Author at last got possession of the Keys of the Inquisition, and can he bring even Popes, &c. before his Bar? That may found a little too harsh; therefore the result is, that it's sham'd upon the People, for such things the Church taught, encourag'd and approv'd. So that, let the Doctrine prevail never so much, the Teachers be never so many, the Practice never so bad, yet here is a Shield, The Church has not taught, &c. I remember it was once put to him, and I find it not answer'd, *We are often blam'd for charging particular Doctrines upon their Church, but we desire to know what it is makes a Doctrine of their Church.* He tells us, we are not to charge upon them every Opinion of Authors, for the profess'd Religion of Papists, — Not the loose and extravagant Opinions of many of her Doctors; Not the different Opinions of School-Doctors, nor the Niceties a Parson designedly enters amongst; but if we come to set Authority against Authority, I know not why an Aquinas, a Bellarmine, a Suarez, &c. may not vye with our Author, and as soon be heard. And why a Profession of his own, That I have declar'd nothing as an Article of Faith, but what has been thus positively determined by the Church Representative, or is so acknowledged by the whole Body Diffusive, (which it seems he

has

Doctrin. and  
Pract. p. 13.

To the Reader.  
P. 56.

P. 57.

has consulted) should bear down the Authority of many of her Doctors and School-Divines, when they both have come forth with the Approbation of their Church, and never were condemn'd by it, for teaching against it. And now the Controversy is depending betwixt them, and we are to attend which gives the most faithful account of the Doctrine and Practices of the Church of Rome; the Schoolmen of old time, or the Representers of this.

5. When all other helps fail, he has one yet in reserve, for the ending of this Controversy, which is a Challenge he throws out to the Author of the Answer to the Representers Reflection upon the State and View, and not to him, but to all the Ministers; nay, to all the Protestants of this Nation: [Shew us the Papists to agree with those Characters, that have been given them out of the Pulpits.] This is the Sum of no less than ten Pages he has wrote in Reply to this. But now, besides the uncharitableness of this Course, which is to enquire into the Lives of those of his Communion, and to make Descants upon them; and which when he appeals to, he gives a Provocation not to be very overly in: Besides this, it's of no use here; For,

1. It's an Argument that is contingent, and (1.) which any sort of People may venture at. Thus the *Turks* may Challenge the Christians, whether they be the People the Christians represent them. Let them come and see (may they say) whether we are not as Temperate, as Just, &c. as the *Greeks* among whom we live; and if Religion were to be judg'd of, as to its truth and goodness by such a comparison, whether we might not as well pretend to it as the other. And if they find us in all things like the rest of Mankind, without more horns and heads, then who are the Misrepresenter? And yet, thus our Author argues. This the Protestants may turn upon the Papists after this manner, Shew us the Protestants that agree with the Papists Character of them. There are few Papists, but have some Relations, Neighbours, Correspondents, Acquaintance, or Conversation with some Protestants. What I require of them then, is to compare these Protestants they know, with the Ideas, Notions, and Characters of a Papist-Protestant, that is, with the Notions, that have been taught them by their Priests, Pulpits, and Books. Let 'em tell me upon due Consideration, whether they are meer Atheists, and worship the Devil, and act in defiance of their own Conscience; and Profess the Broad way leading to Destruction, and grant Libertinism to the highest degree of Wickedness, &c.

(2.) It's Contingent, as the same Persons and People may be good and bad, better and worse in divers States and Circum-

To the Reader, p. 11.

To the Reader, p. 8.

stances. If this be a good Argument, it will always be so in all Ages and Cafes ; and go where you will, and take them where you will, you will always find the Papist to answer our Authors Character, and never to come up to the Pulpit-Character of him. But I dare say, our Author will not allow this to be a fair Method of proceeding ; and that for Example, a Protestant should describe a Papist according to *the great number of Matters of Fact*, which with our Author he may find by Writers of their own, charg'd upon them, *such as Massacres, Usurpations, Murders of Princes, Treasons, Plots, Conspiracies, Persecutions ; the vicious and scandalous Lives of some of her chief Prelates, [Popes] their Pride, Covetousness and Luxury ; as likewise, the ill Examples of other Ecclesiastical Dignitaries, as of Cardinals, Bishops, Priests ; their Ignorance, Simony, Oppression, Cruelties, Excesses, &c.* And I may add, the dissoluteness of manners prevailing throughout the Papal Dominions in some Ages. Was ever this the State of the Papacy ? If it was, as our Author cannot deny, then why may not we take the Character of a Papist from such an age, as well as the Age or Place where we live ? Or, why not from another Country, as well as from our own ? This indeed our Author sometimes refers to. For, saith he, *This [That 'tis only mistake and passion makes Popery so deform'd a Monster] every one will conclude to be true, who has taken a prospect of Holland, and those Towns of Germany, in which Papists and Protestants live together in one Corporation, under the same Laws, and making use in some places, even of the same Churches too ; and this with such Freedom, Amity and good Correspondence, that their different Communion cannot be easily discovered ; and a man that should come out of England, with his Head glowing with our Pulpit-Popery, would not be easily convinc'd of the being of any Papists there. Now 'tis certain, the Papists here and there are of the same Church, Principles and Faith, and 'tis no Difference in this kind, makes them there like other Men, and here like Monsters ; but 'tis because there the Papists are what they are, and here they are made to be what they are not, but what their Maligners please to render them.*

I might here shew how far our Author is out in matter of Fact, that tho these live together, yet it is with great difference. However, supposing what he saith to be true, yet that is no fit way to judge of their Religion by ; since whatever Freedom, Amity, and good Correspondence they have or exercise, is

†

not

not from their *Church, Principles and Faith*, but from other reasons which are Political, such as Interest and Self-preservation, &c. For if it was from their *Church, Principles and Faith*, Popery would be all over the World the same Popery as it is in *Holland*, and the places of *Germany* he speaks of. But there is a vast difference betwixt Popery and Popery; betwixt Popery when it is alone, and Popery when it is diluted with Protestantism. And if we would know what it is, the fairer way to judg of it, is where it is alone; not as in *Holland*, and *Germany*, or *England*, but as in *Italy*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, and I may add now in *France*. For there is the *Church, Principles, and Faith*, in *puris naturalibus*; and if we are to be referred to judg of what it is, by the Lives and Practices of its Professors, thither in reason we are to go; pass we over the *Alps*, and the *Pyrenean Mountains*, or indeed the narrow Seas, and there we may take a better View and Prospect, than in a few *Converts* here; who yet I doubt will generally be found without being *rigorously observ'd*, not to have chang'd their *Lives* for the better, no more than their Religion.

Sayings, p. 7.

2. After all, this is not to the purpose. For the Question is, what is Popery, and whether the Pulpits have truly represented it or not? And Popery certainly was not there describ'd from the Lives of the present Professors of it in this Nation; but from its Principles, and the Practices of their Church in Conformity to those Principles. Our Author surely will acknowledg that Popery is always the same, that it is what it hath been, and it hath been what it is; and if so, his way must conclude against it self; unless he will say in all Ages, and all Countreys, Men of that Religion have lived alike; and therefore, to know whether the Pulpits have represented Popery aright or no, we must go not to the Lives of any Age or Place alone, nor to the Refinements and Expositions of a new Generation, but to the Authorities the Preachers went upon. But this is a troublesome task, and what suited not our Author's temper or design; and so he quitted the one for the other. It's a pleasant Entertainment to write a Character, or a Representation; the Pen runs smoothly along, when it has Comparison before it, and all the business is to describe, invite, or inveigh; but when there are Breaks and Interruptions; when it is to argue closely, to manage an Argument, or to Answer it, it requires another sort of Talent; and what our Author wasily avoids. And if he is beat out of his Road, and the Artifice has been detected, yet it shall

shall go hard, if he finds not out some Retrenchments to secure himself.

Thus has he proceeded from Representation to Reflection, from Reflection to Protestation, from Protestation to Accommodation, from Accommodation to Reflection again, from Reflection to Caution, from Caution to Character; and at last, for the *ending of this Controversy*, to prospect; that is, from the Principles and Practices of the Papists, he appeals to their Lives amongst us. This is his last Refuge, and if that fails him, it is but to find a new Title or Method, and then he appears without Wound or Scar. And he may in the Conclusion of his Book, tell the World what Feats he has done, what *Religious Frauds* he detected, and how *unsuccessful* he render'd them in his *first Book*. So that if his Reader be as credulous as he himself is confident, and secure in his own good Opinion, this may be a Winding-sheet to the Controversy, and his Adversaries be eternally silenced.

Sayings, p. 57.

*Answer to the  
Representers  
Reflect. on the  
View, p. 67.  
Sayings, p. 12.  
Answer to the  
Repr. Reflect.  
p. 28, &c.*

But if the Reader casts his Eye a little back, he will see from Point to Point, how he has left the Cause to shift for it self. And whereas, now it had become him to have discharg'd himself from so gross an Imputation, we must be contented to have one answer to that, and all the rest, that they are *too impertinent to deserve any*. Such we are to account the Charge of his Representing by halves; of continuing his Misrepresentations without Replying to the Answers; of his not answering the *View*; of his common, but vain Allegation, that we pretend to know Popery better than they themselves; of his abusing Mr. *Montague*; of his Insincerity, particularly, when he offers to receive us into the Church of *Rome* upon his Representing Terms; and when he professes to detest some Doctrines and Practices charged upon the Church of *Rome*, &c. But here he will say, I make too much haste, for the two last Points he has reply'd to in the Close. But truly it's after such a manner, and so faintly, as if he hop'd 'twould be overlook'd.

Sayings, p. 55.

As for Example. As to the first he Replies, *This offer may be said to have been answer'd over and over. But the matter of Fact defeats all those Answers, and is a Demonstration that they are nothing but shuffling.* Now what is *this matter of Fact*, and where is this *Demonstration*? That follows *For whilst a man may be received upon those Terms, and yet cannot be received unless he assents to the Faith of the Church, 'tis evident, that in that Character, the faith of the Church is truly Represented.*

*Answer to  
Reflect p. 32.*

Any one that reads this, would be apt to think that the *matter of Fact* had never been questioned, or had been prov'd to a *Demonstration*, beyond possibility of Reply. But besides what has been before answer'd to it over and over, as he confesses, it was particularly considered by the *Answerer to his Reflections*, and the offer, i. shew'd to be a 'ludicrous one, 'made without good Faith, and with no other meaning than to put some 'colour upon his deceitful Characters of a Papist.

2. It was replied further, 'that suppose we could accept, and should 'be accepted upon the Terms he propounds, yet we have no security that 'when we are in, this Representers either can, or will, if he could save us from 'being prest to profess and practice that Popery which he either denies or 'conceals. And that because on the one hand we are certain that the prevailing part of his Church holds that, which he either rejects from his 'Faith, or says nothing of, and that agreeably to their Councils and publick 'Offices. And on the other hand, we have no reason to believe his Authority



'rity in the *Roman Church* to be considerable enough to carry on his Representation, when the turn is once serv'd.

Here the Answerer appeals to the case of *Imbert*, of the Physician at *Goa*, and last of all to that of the poor Citizens of *Orange*, p. 39.

The Answerer shews further, that 'we have not any good reason to trust him, he having not given us any reasonable assurance that himself rejects that Popery, which he exclaims against.

And last of all he puts this question, 'Whether he would refuse us, if we desired to come into the *Roman Communion*, with that which we call old Popery.

To all which our Author replies after this manner:

1. *Our new Adversary has one cavil here to put in, viz. [That the Character of the Papist represented, is not a good Character, because the Faith of a Papist as stated under each Article, is not All his Faith.]* Our Author has been so unkind as not to refer us to the Page for these words he pretends to quote from the *Answer*; and I think after a careful perusal, I may safely lodg them at his own door, as an instance of his Misrepresenting Faculty. Any one that knew the Answerer, and is conversant in his way of writing, knows well he had too clear a head to express himself in so insipid and nonsensical a way as our Author would fasten upon him, and so as to argue against the truth of the Character, *because the Faith of a Papist, as stated under each Article, is not all his Faith.* But however the Argument is not so obscure, as his Answer to it is impertinent, as might be shewn, were it to the purpose before us.

2. He proceeds, *This man has still another scruple, That (if he should come into our Church upon the terms I have proposed, whether I will be security, that he shall not be prest to profess and practise that Popery, which I have either deny'd or conceal'd.)* To this our Author answers after a surprising manner: *Marry (saith he) if he means by that Popery, the Pulpit-Popery, I'll give him the same security I have my self, viz. the Assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to his Church, which will never permit it to lead her members into such Abominations. He may have the security too of a good conscience, which cannot be prest to the profession of so much evil.* Sayings, p. 56.

But what is his security worth; or how can he plead the Holy Ghost's Assistance for not being led by her into such Abominations, when she pleads it for their belief and practice? Our Author would be understood, that he calls not an Image or Crucifix out of its name when he saith it's an Image of wood or stone; and that he speaks consonantly to the sense of his Church, when he saith the Image is not adored or pray'd to, but Christ or the Saint in the Image. And yet the *French Physician* was clap'd up in the Inquisition for the former; and the *Condomian Imbert* was imprison'd for the latter. And surely the Inquisitors of *Goa*, and Archbishop of *Bordeaux* are themselves of that Church which he saith has the promise of the Holy Ghost, &c. And who shall decide this case, or what security have we against the Protestants fate, if at *Goa*, or of *Imbert's*, if in the Diocess of *Bordeaux*? Well, but however, saith he, a man may have the security of a good conscience, which cannot be prest to the profession of so much evil. How not be prest? What is pressing if the Dragoons of *Orange* be not? What, if not the Prison of *Bordeaux*? What, if not the Inquisition at *Goa*? O, but

## Pulpit-Popery, True Popery

but Conscience cannot be prest to the profession of it. A very comfortable inducement to comply with the Terms of the Representatives. For you may come into the Church upon them; and if it will come in, the Church will oblige you to profess abominable things; however Conscience is free, and the Inquisition it self cannot force it; and if you be sincere, you will never be prest by that or any external violence, to the profession of so much evil. It's well our Author is not at Goa to have his sincerity try'd.

But yet he hath not done. For he adds,

3. *In this (the Answer above given) he may see his other Material Question answer'd, [Whether he may be admitted into our Communion with that which he calls old Popery?] For if his old Popery be the Pulpit-Popery, he sees we reject it; and I tell him, that whatsoever Church would receive him, with the profession of all those scandalous Doctrines the Pulpits charge against us, I would be sure to be no member of it.*

Pag 35.

Here our Author sinks away from the Case. For as soon as ever the Answerer had put the Question, he proceeds, *Will the Representer take us by the hand and present us to his Church, if we should come with the Lateran Popery about deposing Sovereigns for Heresie, and with the Trent-Popery about the Worship of Images, as it is understood by Bellarmine, or rather by Capisucchi, and as it is practis'd by the Tartuffs of the Roman Church, and with all that old Popery which the former Answerer gives an account of? Why has not our Author laid the case as it was put to him? Why not the old Popery of Lateran, Bellarmine and Capisucchi, as well as Pulpit-popery? And when he has thrown the Cover of Pulpit-Popery over it; yet why must he needs add, with All the scandalous Doctrines the Pulpits charge? For surely if there be such abomination in them, any one of them should be sufficient to an honest soul to fly the Communion, where the belief or practice of it is requir'd. Well, let Schoolmen and Cardinals, Aquinas and Scotus, Bellarmine and Capisucchi, let old Missals and Rituale, nay let Councils, the old one of Lateran, and the new one of Trent, be call'd in, they are but Tartuffs; for Exposition and Representation are now the Standard of Romish Doctrine. And if the Tartuffism of Deposition of Princes, and Adoration of Images, and the rest of the once old and new Pulpit-Popery be part of its Faith and Doctrine, we have our Authors word for it, *I would be as Dark as soon as their Popish*. A very gross affront to those Venerable Heads; and if he hath not some reserve, and somewhat of the Art of Cardinal Capisucchi, may throw him into bad circumstances, and he would do well to keep from Goa or Bourdeaux, lest a Recantation or somewhat worse be the effect of such a frank declaration.*

Pag 54.

But it seems after all the Protestations and Abominations, the Answerer was not satisfied in our Author's sincerity, and would bind him to have Terms, which is to tell us in particular what those monstrous things are that he so frequently declares against; which because our Author answers only in general, I shall remind him of, and conclude. *Its this. Have I challenge you to declare what those particulars are, Those Monstrosities, those Doctrines and practices which you do detest and abominate, And if you refuse to fasten upon you the mark of insincere and unjust, for offering that all be received into the Church of Rome without exam.*

Answer to  
Reflect. p. 37.

